DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 292 982 CE 049 911

AUTHOR Wood, Miriam M.
TITLE What Does the Independent Sector Do for 16-24 Year-Olds?
INSTITUTION William T. Grant Foundation, Washington, DC. Commission on Work, Family, and Citizenship.
PUB DATE [88]
NOTE 78p.; A product of Youth and America's Future. For other papers in this series, see CE 049 906-912 and CE 049 914.
AVAILABLE FROM Institute for Educational Leadership, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 310, Washington, DC 20036-5541 ($10.00).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; Agency Cooperation; *Agency Role; Client Characteristics (Human Services); *Human Services; *Nonprofit Organizations; *Organizational Effectiveness; Philanthropic Foundations; *Private Agencies; Religious Organizations; Voluntary Agencies; Volunteers; *Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Private Sector

ABSTRACT

Statistics describing the independent sector are incomplete and ambiguous. This is especially true in the area of services provided to youths between the ages of 16 and 24. According to Internal Revenue Service files, the independent sector consists of 821,000 organizations, including nonprofit organizations, churches, colleges and universities, hospitals, and foundations. Of these, 32,500 are youth organizations, which means that 50 percent or more of their members or clients are between the ages of 12 and 19. Among membership-oriented organizations, participation declines dramatically as youngsters enter their teen years. An additional 156,000 human service organizations have 50 percent or more of their clients and/or members in the 20-59 age range. Forty-three percent of churches sponsor youth groups. Among agencies catering to children and youth, 25 percent are engaged primarily in recreation. Nearly 7 out of every 10 organizations concerned with employment and training, housing and community development, and legal and advocacy assistance receive some form of government support as opposed to only 5.5 of every 10 agencies involved in culture, arts, and recreation. Poor persons constitute over half the clientele at 29 percent of agencies, and 15 percent serve blacks primarily. Disinterested assessment of independent sector programs is rarely undertaken. Consequently, neither the participation rates of youth nor the impact of that participation on their quality of life are known. (This paper includes commentaries by Leonard W. Stern and Virginia Hodgkinson.) (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED292982

What Does the Independent Sector Do For 16-24 Year-Olds?

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William T. Grant Foundation

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by
Miriam M. Wood

CE049911

Youth and America's Future:
The William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship

YOUTH AND AMERICA'S FUTURE:
THE WILLIAM T. GRANT FOUNDATION COMMISSION ON WORK, FAMILY AND CITIZENSHIP

When William Thomas Grant established the Grant Foundation in 1936, he sought a better understanding of the ways in which individuals adapt to the vicissitudes of life. Touched in his professional life by the importance of good human relationships, Mr. Grant wished to "help children develop what is in them" so they would better "enjoy all the good things the world has to offer them."

Fifty years later, recognizing the special needs of older adolescents in our changing society, the Foundation's Trustees established **Youth and America's Future** with much the same purpose; its charge is to evaluate current knowledge, stimulate new ideas, increase communication among researchers, practitioners and policymakers, and, thus, to help our nation chart a better future for youth.

The Foundation's President, Robert J. Haggerty, M.D., has described the Commission's unique perspective:

"Against a rising chorus of legitimate concern about the many problems facing today's youth, the Foundation has initiated this Commission on Youth and America's Future to speak in a different voice. It will explore the strengths of America's young men and women, their famlilies and the programs and community institutions that serve them. We adopt this approach not to diminish the importance of the problems that exist, but to learn the lessons of success. The Foundation is confident that this effort to look with renewed respect at youth, where it strides as well as where it stumbles, will help forge the links of understanding and mutual responsibility that make our democracy strong."

The publications in this series have been prepared to inform the Commission and to stimulate its thinking. While the Commission does not necessarily endorse the various findings presented, it does encourage their thoughtful consideration in the interests of American youth.

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Harold Howe II, Chairperson
Senior Lecturer, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA

Byllye Y. Avery
Executive Director, National Black Women's Health Project, Atlanta, GA

Mary Jo Bane
Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA

Lewis H. Butler
President, California Tomorrow, San Francisco, CA

Fletcher L. Byrom
Retired Chairman and CEO, Koppers Company, Carefree, AZ

Hillary Rodham Clinton
The Governor's Mansion; Partner, The Rose Law Firm, Little Rock, AR

Barbara J. Easterling
Executive Vice President, Communications Workers of America, Washington, D.C.

Josué M. González
President of the Board, Latino Institute; Director, Bureau of Resource Development, Chicago Public Schools, Chicago, IL

Albert H. Hastorf
Professor of Psychology, Stanford University Stanford, CA

Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C.
President (Emeritus), University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN

David W. Hornbeck
Maryland State Superintendent of Schools, Baltimore, MD

Douglas X. Patiño
President and CEO, Marin Community Foundation, Larkspur, CA

Michael V. Reagen
Director, Missouri Department of Social Services, Jefferson City, MO

Henry W. Riecken
Professor (Emeritus) of Behavioral Sciences, School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA

Kenneth S. Rolland
Managing Director, Chemical Bank, New York, NY

Bernard C. Watson
President and CEO, William Penn Foundation, Philadelphia, PA

William Julius Wilson
Professor of Sociology and Public Policy, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL

Daniel Yankelovich
Chairman, Daniel Yankelovich Group, New York, NY

Robert J. Haggerty, MD (ex-officio)
President, William T. Grant Foundation, New York, NY

COMMISSION STAFF

Samuel Halperin
Study Director

Atelia Melaville
Research Associate

Arlette Taylor
Executive Assistant

WHAT DOES THE INDEPENDENT SECTOR DO FOR 16-24 YEAR OLDS?

Miriam M. Wood

This paper was prepared for the Commission by **Dr. Miriam M. Wood**. Dr. Wood, an independent consultant whose primary interest is in the leadership and management of non-profit organizations, is the author of Trusteeship in the Private College (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985) and of articles in Harvard Business Review and Educational Record.

Publications of the Commission are *not* copyrighted. The reproduction and distribution of Commission publications is *encouraged*. When quoting or reproducing Commission publications, please note the source as: **"Youth and America's Future: The William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship."**

WHAT DOES THE INDEPENDENT SECTOR DO FOR 16-24 YEAR OLDS?

Miriam M. Wood

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Executive Summary	2
Introduction	6
Independent sector organizations serving 16-24 year-olds	10
Types of services available to the 16-24 age group	12
Funding of human service organizations	14
Geographic density of human service organizations	19
Membership and clientele of human service organizations	20
Principal issues concerning youth organizations and human service agencies catering to young adults	23
Theories and rationales supporting or faulting the role and function of independent sector organizations	34
Author's concluding observations	42
Bibliography	46
Biography of author	49
Commentaries	
Leonard W. Stern	50
Virginia Hodgkinson	66

Executive Summary

- **Caveat emptor!** Statistics describing the independent sector are incomplete and ambiguous. The author, pushing onward where angels fear to tread, has manipulated this inexact data to correspond to the Commission's interest in the 16-24 age cohort, about which information is not collected. Similarly, qualitative findings about the independent sector remain, strictly speaking, hypothetical in the absence of replicated studies. In truth, we cannot answer the question, "What has the independent sector done for youth aged 16-24?" At best, we circle the topic.
- The independent sector is comprised of the 821,000 organizations, including those found under IRS sub-sections 501(c)(3) and (c)(4), as well as churches. Under sub-section 501(c)(3) are 325,000 human service agencies and 28,000 other organizations including colleges and universities, hospitals, and foundations. Churches qualify as 501(c)(3)s but need not apply for tax-exempt status; the number of churches is estimated to be 338,000. Under sub-section 501(c)(4) are 130,000 social welfare organizations. These statistics, based on IRS files, may underestimate the number of organizations in the sector by hundreds of thousands.
- 32,500 human service agencies are "youth organizations," meaning that 50% or more of their members or clients are aged 12-19, but we do not know how many clients and members in these agencies are aged sixteen, seventeen, eighteen, or nineteen.
- Among membership-oriented youth organizations, participation declines dramatically as youngsters enter their teen years, and we do not know how many members of these organizations are aged sixteen, seventeen,

eighteen, or nineteen.

- Regarding 20-24 year-olds, we know that 156,000 human service organizations have 50% or more of their clients and/or members in the age range 20-59. However, we do not know how many of those actually served are young adults aged twenty, twenty-one, twenty-two, twenty-three, or twenty-four.
- In terms of access, it appears that 225,000 human service organizations--3 out of every 4 agencies -- include at least some segment of the Commission's target population among their clients or members.
- Forty-three percent of churches (142,000) sponsor youth groups, and 20% of youth aged 18-24 attend religious services at least once a week.
- The number of 501(c)(4)s serving ages 16-24 is not known, but youth and young adults are unlikely to be significantly represented in this group of organizations.
- Among agencies catering to children and youth, 25% are engaged primarily in recreation. Among agencies catering to adults, including young adults aged 20-24, 18% are recreational or cultural.
- In one service area that might be expected to impact on the Commission's target population -- comprised of employment and training, housing and community development, and legal and advocacy assistance -- nearly 7 out of 10 organizations receive some form of government support, and for this area in toto, 52% of expenditures are funded by government. By comparison, although 5.5 out of 10 agencies involved in culture, arts, and recreation receive some form of government support, only 14% of expenditures in this service area are funded by government. In neither of these service areas is it known how many youth and young adults aged 16-24 are members or clients.
- 46% of human service agencies were founded between 1970 and 1982, a

period during which the population increased 14%.

- The poor are more than half the clientele at 29% of agencies and the unemployed account for more than half the clientele at 19% of agencies. Fifteen percent of agencies serve blacks primarily, 4% serve Hispanics primarily, 3% serve Asian-Americans primarily and 11% have "other" minority populations as more than half their clientele. The extent to which these categories overlap is unknown, as is the proportion of 16-24 year-olds served.
- The participation of able, volunteer adults is essential to many, but not all, youth organizations, and volunteers' availability, attitudes, and abilities seem to be changing.
- To the extent that independent sector organizations are in competition for funds, clients, and members, effective cooperation in the provision of programs for youth and young adults may be difficult to achieve.
- The most lucrative avenue for raising new agency revenues is neither private gifts nor sales but client and membership fees. This fact raises questions about the future capacity of the independent sector to serve poor and underprivileged youth and young adults.
- In designing human service programs, the characteristics of minority subcultures should be taken into account. In the black community, for example, the church plays a culturally distinctive role that might be utilized in programming for youth and young adults.
- As an occupation, work with youth and young adults is poorly paid in comparison to other professional and quasi-professional positions.
- A pluralist ideology is the basis of our assumption that independent sector agencies are good for society and are an appropriate vehicle for implementing social policies to enhance the development of youth and young adults.

- The notion of adolescence as a vulnerable period is a social artifact, as is the age range to which the term youth is customarily applied.
- Disinterested assessment of independent sector programs is rarely undertaken. In general, neither the participation rates of 16-24 year-olds nor the impact of that participation on their quality of life is known.

Introduction

There are approximately 1,176,000 private nonprofit organizations. Of these, those classified as 501(c)(3) or 501(c)(4), together with churches, comprise the so-called independent sector. Research on these organizations is in its infancy, but according to recently developed statistical summaries, the independent sector is made up of an estimated 821,000 organizations, or 4.2% of all documented organizational entities.[1] Making up this total are:

353,000	charitable organizations [501(c)(3) including 325,000 human service agencies and 28,000 other entities such as colleges and universities, hospitals, and foundations;[2]
338,000	churches -- churches qualify as 501(c)(3)s but need not apply for tax-exempt status,[3] and
130,000	social welfare organizations [501(c)(4)s] that promote the general welfare through civic and social improvements.

Contributions made to 501(c)(3)s are tax-deductible while those made to 501(c)(4)s are generally non-deductible.[4]

Significantly, the 353,000 charitable organizations and 130,000 social welfare organizations documented through IRS files constitute an official,

---

[1] Virginia Ann Hodgkinson and Murray S. Weitzman, Dimensions of the Independent Sector: A Statistical Profile (2nd ed.), Washington, D.C.: 1986, p. 20. The authors remark (p. 11) that "counting the number of institutions in the independent sector is a challenge."

[2]To keep the number of human service agencies at a mathematically convenient 325,000, the residual category has been adjusted downward by 1300. That is, there are 1800 colleges and universities, 24,000 foundations, and 3500 hospitals for a total of 29,300 according to Hodgkinson and Weitzman, pp. 20 and 128.

[3]Hodgkinson and Weitzman note that the number of churches is an estimate by the National Council of Churches of Christ.

[4]For a comprehensive overview of IRS treatment of the independent sector and other nonprofit organizations, see John G. Simon, "The Tax Treatment of Nonprofit Organizations: A Review of Federal and State Policies" in Walter W. Powell, ed., The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1987, pp. 67-98.

outward surface, obscuring somewhat the inner dynamics of the independent sector. Consider, for example, that some independent sector entities are organized, but have no official status; this might be called the first level of organized altruism. A second stage is marked by receipt of a charter as a private, nonprofit organization, and the third stage by receipt of a tax number from the IRS. The permeability of the independent sector --the capacity of new organizations to join its ranks -- has been a vaunted strength of American democracy, but the sector's exact dimensions remain unknown. In developing statistics we focus by default on entities recognized by the Internal Revenue Service, although there are "hundreds of thousands more" not included on the IRS lists.[5]

Of particular interest here is the human services sub-sector. Agencies providing so-called "human services" are typically small. Their median number of employees is 4 full-time and 2 part-time, and at least 1 in 4 has no employees at all.[6]

Distinctive to this paper is the conception that human service agencies are either *developmental-recreational* in overall organizational purpose, as are scouting organizations, or *compensatory-helping*, as are drug abuse clinics. Within this framework, developmental-recreational and compensatory-helping organizations serving young people aged 16-24 tend to focus on different issues. To oversimplify, the compensatory-helping organizations provide services to offset a problem that has been identified by the schools, police, parents, or even the young person, and these organizations are animated by the social work ethic. Developmental-recreational organizations provide services that they hope

---

[5] This is the observation of Russy D. Sumariwalla, a senior fellow at United Way of America, quoted in "New Taxonomy Planned for Non-Profit Groups," Chronicle of Higher Education, March 11, 1987, p. 32.

[6] Kirsten A. Gronbjerg, Madeleine A. Kimmich, and Lester M. Salamon, The Chicago Nonprofit Sector in a Time of Retrenchment, Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press, 1985, p.4.

will prevent problems and strengthen the positive potential of youth or young adults; many of these agencies are dependent upon the participation of adult volunteers.[7] An assumption implicit in both types of organizations seems to be that youth and young adults, left alone, are likely to become the willing victims of negative social influences.

In a field where data is scarce, the most statistically precise information about organizations serving the Commission's target group is embedded in research completed during 1982-83 on a 12-city sample of 3,411 human service agencies roughly representative of the totality of 325,000 human service agencies.[8] For reference, an overview of these agencies is provided in the table below. The table shows the percent of human service agencies in each primary service area with the percent of sector dollars expended in that same service area. ("Primary" is defined as that service in which an agency has 50% or more of its clientele.) Although the table illustrates that mathematically disproportional dollars are expended for both health services and residential care, the conclusion that certain services are over- or under-funded is a value judgment not implied here. Overall, 18% of all human service organizations are developmental-recreational, while the majority (72%) are compensatory-helping.

---

[7] For example, Boy and Girl Scouts are developmental-recreational, while organizations offering family counselling or services for the physically handicapped are compensatory-helping; more problematic, perhaps, is categorization of Boys' and Girls' Clubs, which are here considered developmental-recreational. The National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities, recently developed by Independent Sector, has a seperate category for "Youth Development" organizations that corresponds to my developmental-recreational category but includes compensatory-helping services for youth in its general categories such as "Health-Mental Retardation" or "Human Service, Other Including Multipurpose" that include all age groups.

[8] Madeleine H. Kimmich, Michael Gutowski, and Lester M. Salamon, Child-Serving Nonprofits in an Era of Government Retrenchment. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 1985, pp. 15-17 and Kirsten A. Gronbjerg, Madeleine H. Kimmich, and Lester M. Salamon, The Chicago Nonprofit Sector in a Time of Government Retrenchment, Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press, 1985, footnote on p. 4.

Human Service Organizations
Comparison of Primary Service with Dollars Expended[9]

	% of Agencies in Primary Service Area	% of Sector Expenditures Allocated to Service Area
Developmental-Recreational		
Culture/Arts/Recreation	18.4%	17.6%
Compensatory-Helping		
Social Services (counselling, information and referral, day care, etc.)	23.6	18.9
Education/Research (deaf and other special populations, adult education, libraries, etc.)	13.0	12.6
Health Services (counselling and screening, drug/alcohol abuse services, etc.)	8.1	13.0
Institutional/residential care	6.2	16.6
Housing/Community Development	4.1	4.0
Legal Services/Advocacy	3.5	4.0
Mental Health	2.6	5.2
Employment/Training/Income Security	4.1	7.0
Multiservice (no service with 50% o more of clientele)	16.4	NA

A significant caveat is now in order. The Commission has conceived of youth aged 16-24 as non-college-going, employed, or unemployed. For this population, however, statistics comparable to the table above do not exist. Data indicating the number of independent sector organizations serving the 16-24 cohort in toto, as well as the non-collegiate sub-group of particular interest to the Commission, is simply not collected. Also, the Commission's age grouping -- which tracks the US Census' employment statistic -- straddles the cohorts typically used in research, where youth is defined as ages 11 or 12 to 18 or 19 and adult classifications may or may not include a breakdown for ages 20-24.[10]

---

[9] Gronbjerg et al., pg. 20.

[10] Even the United States Census Bureau is somewhat inconsistent in the age cohorts offered for analysis to the casual (i.e., off-line) consumer of demographic statistics. For example, tables projecting the population by age, race, etc. use age cohorts 5-17 and 18-25, while tables showing living

In this paper, persons aged 20-24 are referred to as "young adults" to distinguish them from the broader adult population into which they (and their organizational affiliations) are customarily subsumed. Also, the term "youth agency" typically refers to organizations serving primarily ages 11-19, and that definition is employed here.

Statistics are not available on services provided by 501(c)(4)s. Therefore, this paper will focus on 501(c)(3)s, especially human service organizations.

Independent Sector Organizations Serving 16-24 Year Olds

Of the approximately 325,000 human service 501(c)(3)s, ten percent, or 32,500 organizations, are "youth agencies," meaning that 50% or more of their clients or members are aged 12-19.[11] In an additional 91,000 agencies, youth aged 12-19 constitute between ten and fifty percent of the clientele. However, of the total of 123,500 agencies with at least ten percent of their clientele in the 12-19 age group, we do not know how many are aged sixteen, seventeen, eighteen, or nineteen.

For the 20-24 year-olds, we know only that forty-eight percent of human service organizations, or 156,000 agencies, have over half of their clients or members in the adult age range of 20-59 years. In an additional 68,000 agencies, adults in the age range 20-59 constitute between ten and fifty percent of the clientele. However, of the total of 224,000 agencies with at least ten percent of their clientele in the 20-59 age group, we do not know how many are aged twenty, twenty-one, twenty-two, twenty-three, or twenty-four.

---

arrangements use age cohorts 15-19 and 20-34. Employment tables typically use a 16-19 and 20-24 age breakdown. See Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1987, Department of Commerce/Bureau of the Census, pp. 16, 46, and 379.

[11] The age cohorts used for analysis by the Urban Institute include Children (under 12), Youths (12-19), Adults (20-59), and Elderly (60 and older). See Gronbjerg et al,. p. 35.

As these statistics suggest, agencies offering services to ages 16-24 have clients in other age groups as well. Even youth organizations such as Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts consider adults to be part of their clientele, and it is conceivable that most services delivered to ages 16-19 are not provided by youth agencies.[12] It is certain that most services offered to ages 20-24 are supplied by organizations that serve a broader adult age group, but whether the services actually consumed by ages 20-24 are supplied by agencies dominated by a young adult clientele is not known.

Looking at the data yet another way, we may conclude that 16-24 year-olds are unlikely to be served by the 26,000 organizations engaged primarily in day care or by the 42,250 organizations serving the elderly primarily.* By this reckoning, about 255,000 organizations, or three out of four human service agencies, offer services to at least some segment of the Commission's target population.

Forty-three percent of churches, or 142,000 religious congregations, sponsor youth groups.[13] About 20% of youth aged 18-24 attend religious services every week or several times each week. We can assume that all religious congregations, or 338,000 organizations, serve the Commission's target population.

Data is not available on 501(c)(4)s, which include volunteer fire departments, neighborhood organizations to maintain common green areas or prevent crime, industrial development associations, and other agencies dedicated to civic

---

* According to Gronbjerg et al., p. 35, 13% of human service organizations serve the elderly primarily, so the estimated number of agencies is derived by multiplying 325,000 (.13). According to Kimmich et al., pp. 17 and 27, 32% of human service agencies serve children and youth primarily and of these approximately one-quarter provide day care primarily, so the calculation is 325,000 (.32) (.25); the number of parents aged 16-24 with children in day care is unknown and for purposes of this calculation is assumed to be statistically negligible.

[12] This is Kimmich etal.'s conclusion, p. 18.

[13] Lester M. Salamon and Fred Teitelbaum, "Religious Congregations as Social Service Agencies: How Extensive Are They?" Foundation News, September/October, 1984, p. 63. The study is based on a total of 330,000 religious congregations; 338,000 is the more recent figure.

betterment and the social improvement of the community.[14] These are not the kinds of organizations in which the Commission's target clientele is likely to figure significantly as participants.

In sum, we can identify 225,000 human service agencies and 338,000 churches -- a total of 563,000 independent sector organizations -- that offer services to the Commission's target group, but we have no way of estimating the numbers of youth and young adults who actually receive, or consume, the services offered.

Types of Services Available to the 16-24 Age Group

What we can say about services available to ages 16-19 is inferred from data collected about agencies serving infancy through age nineteen. When day care agencies are excluded, a total of 78,000 organizations serve the 0-19 age group, and of these, twenty-five percent, or 19,500 organizations, list recreation as their primary service. Of particular interest to the Commission, most employment and training services for teenagers are subsumed in the recreation category, although some are found in the "mixed" group:

Percent of Agencies Serving Ages 0-19 Primarily, by Type[15]

Developmental-recreational	
Recreation, including most employment and training	25%
Compensatory-helping	
Mixed, including employment, housing, advocacy, and multiservice	23
Social Services, including individual and family counselling	20

[14] Chambers of Commerce, often thought of as the quintessential civic organizations, qualify under sub-section 501(c)(6) as business leagues.

[15] Kimmich et al., pp. 25-27.

Education/Research, principally targeting special populations--deaf, cerebral palsy, juvenile corrections	15
Institutional and Residential, including group homes	8
Health and Mental Health, including maternal and child health	6[16]

What we can say about organizations serving ages 20-24 is inferred from data collected about the 179,000 agencies serving the adult age range 20-59. Among these agencies, social service rather than recreation is the most frequent primary service, and the number of developmental-recreational agencies--estimated at 33,000 -- is nearly 70% greater than for the age range 0-19.

Percent of Agencies Serving Ages 20-59 Primarily, by Type[17]

Developmental-recreational	
Culture/Arts/Recreation, including youth clubs and camping	18.4%
Compensatory-helping	
Social Services, including information and referral, counselling, and day care	23.6
Multiservices, comprised of agencies with no service accounting for more than 50% of expenditures	16.4
Education/Research, including adult education, libraries	13.0
Health Services, including counselling & screening, alcohol/drug abuse services	8.1
Institutional/Residential Care	6.2
Housing/Community Development	4.1
Legal Services/Advocacy	3.5
Mental Health	2.6
Employment/Training/Income Security, including counselling & placement, job development	4.1

Although there is no data to indicate the participation rates for ages 20-24, it appears that in general this age group is not the focus of human service

---

[16] Totals 99% because of rounding.

[17] Gronbjerg et al., p. 20

programming except in selected problem areas such as pregnancy prevention and job training for the disadvantaged.

Independent sector agencies also serve youth and young adults by providing a setting for volunteer work. In 1985, a Gallup Poll found that one out of five in the age cohort 18-24 had, during the past month, done some volunteering that we may infer was accomplished under the auspices of an organized entity.[18] Compared to 1981, however, Gallup found some indication that volunteerism among the age cohort 18-24 may be on the decline.[19] The director of marketing research at United Way of America disputes this inference and asserts that "No one has empirically been able to show that what we're seeing hasn't gone on before."[20]

Funding of Human Service Organizations

Sixty percent of human service agencies receive federal funding in some form. Federal funds supply 38% of sector expenditures, compared to 30% from fees and 21% from private giving.[21] The various sources of revenue for human service agencies have been identified as follows:

---

[18] The Gallup Organization, American Volunteer, 1985, a survey conducted for Independent Sector, pp. 10-11 of the Tabular Analysis. Of those aged 18-24, 67% had done no volunteering during the past month, while 13% described their volunteer activities as "informal, alone." Presumably, the remaining 20% performed their volunteer activities under the auspices of an organization.

[19] Gallup, p. 13.

[20] Quoted in Jim Gorman, "Are They or Aren't They?" Foundation News, January/February 1987, p. 45.

[21] Gronbjerg et al., pp. 46 and 48.

Revenue Sources of Human Service Agencies[22]

Government	38.4%
Fees/dues/charges	29.6
Individual giving	6.4
Special events/ rentals/ sales/etc.	5.7
United Way	5.4
Endowment/investment income	4.6
Foundation grants	3.5
Corporate gifts	3.2
Religious and other federated funders	2.8
Unspecified	.4

To put it another way, $4 of every $10 in the human services comes from some governmental source, and six out of every ten agencies receive at least some government funding.[23] However, the dependence on government monies varies by (A) primary service area, (B) clientele, (C) size of annual expenditures, and (D) age of the organization, as does the percentage of agencies in each area receiving government support:

	Percentage of Total Expenditures Coming from Government	Percentage of Agencies with Any Expenditures Coming from Government
A. Primary Service Area		
Employment/housing /advocacy	52%	68%
Social services	54	62
Multiservice	44	60
Education/research	26	39
Health/Mental health	37	68
Institutional/residential care	50	85
Culture/arts/recreation	14	55

In the area providing services related to employment and training, housing and community development, and legal and advocacy, nearly seven out of ten agencies

---

[22] Gronbjerg et al., p. 45. Statistics are based on 1982 figures.

[23] Gonbjerg et al., p. 48.

receive some form of government support, and for this service area in toto, more than half of expenditures are funded by government. In contrast, in the area comprised of culture, arts, and recreation, only 14% of expenditures is funded by government. Interestingly, some of the monies funnelled through community arts agencies support employment and training programs.

B. Primary Client Focus

Poor	60%	81%
Black	63	80

Government funds account for $6 out of every $10 spent by human service agencies with primary clienteles that are either poor or black. Eighty percent of agencies with a focus on the poor or on blacks receive some form of government support.

C. Size of annual expenditures

Small-under $100,000	24%	40%
Medium-$100,000-$1M	38	69
Large-over $1M	39	85

Large agencies are more than twice as likely as small ones to receive government monies.

D. Age (year formed)

1930 or earlier	24%	57%
1931-1960	33	51
1961-1970	52	62
1971-1982	58	64

Newer agencies are somewhat more likely than older ones to receive some form of government support, but the degree of reliance on government funding is much greater for newer agencies than older ones. This pattern is not overly surprising since nearly half of human service agencies were founded during the period 1971-1982, and often they were formed in response to government funding initiatives.[24]

---

[24] Gronbjerg et al., p. 31.

Examining sources of income for the subset of United Way agencies provides more recent data -- and a slightly different perspective in which United Way support is more than twice as significant as in the aggregate of all agencies (13.3% vs. 5.4%). Interestingly, United Way agencies are no less dependent on government funding than are all agencies on average.

Sources of United Way Agency Income
in Eight Metro Areas, 1986[25]

Government	41.2%
Fees and Dues	21.9
United Way	13.3
Other	13.3
Own Fundraising	10.3

Achieving United Way support, as one executive director puts it, "is kind of like receiving the Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval."[26] Being a United Way agency confers status and provides visibility in the community.

United Way of America encourages its local affiliates to develop client profiles for each program goal and has collected data on various age groups, including teens (ages 10-19) and young adults (ages 20-34). Since the majority of UW dollars support programs that serve a "mixed" age group, that percentage is shown on the table below as a reference point.

---

[25] Profile 1986, Metros I-VIII: Fund Distribution Results by Agency, by Program, Alexandria, VA: United Way of America Research Division, 1986, p. 45.

[26] Conversation with author, October 1986.

Percentage of United Way Dollars Allocated
to Selected Age Groups, 1986
by Program Goal[27]

	Teens (10-19)	Young Adults (20-34)	Mixed Ages
Income Security, Employment, Economic Dev.	5.8%	19.4%	66.4%
Physical Health, Mental Health, Dev. Disabilities	4.6	6.4	67.5
Food, Clothing, Housing, Transportation	1.2	5.3	70.9
Formal and Informal Education	22.5	6.8	45.4
Environmental Protection	7.2	--	59.9
Public Protection, Consumer Protection, Disaster Preparedness	5.9	4.0	82.3
Social Adjustment, Arts, Culture, Religion	17.9	5.4	56.2
Social Organizations, Voluntarism, Technical Assistance	1.9	4.0	79.6

The United Way has also calculated the types of agencies most likely to receive UW support and the types of agencies experiencing the highest percentage of increase in UW dollars during the period 1984-86. The types of agencies most likely to receive UW support during 1986 were (in order of frequency) Aging, Day Care, Mental Health, YMCA/YM-YWCA, and Family Service.[28] The types of agencies that have experienced the highest percentage of increase in UW dollars allocated

---

[27] Profile 1986, p. 64.

[28] Profile 1986, p. 9.

during 1984-86 are Short-term Aid (57.5%), Women's Crisis (57.4%), Heart Agencies (57.2%), Education (38.6%), and Child Welfare (35.9%).[29] In any of these rising categories, it would be surprising to find the Commission's target group as the primary clientele, although some part of the target group is undoubtedly served by all of them except for those concerned with aging and heart disease.

Geographic Density of Human Service Organizations

The density of human service agency locations varies from state to state and among municipalities within a single state. An analysis of 1977 data from the census of service industries suggests that the density of nonprofit organizations is "considerably higher" in the northeastern part of the country than in the west and south. However, since more than once human service "outlet" can operate under a single nonprofit charter or 501(c)(3) tax number, such statistics may be misleading.

Nonprofit Organizations Per 100,000 Population[30]
(excluding churches)

Northeast	58.2
North Central	50.2
West	48.4
South	36.8
U.S. average	47.1

There are no statistics comparing the density of human service organizations in urban, suburban, and rural settings. However, one effect of social and economic problems in the ghetto seems to be the erosion of support for basic institutions such as churches and schools and, we may infer, human service

---

[29] Profile 1986, p. 12.

[30] Lester M. Salamon, "The Nonprofit Sector and the Rise of Third-Party Government: the Scope, Character, and Consequences of Government Support of Nonprofit Organizations," presentation at the Independent Sector Research Forum, 1983, p. 18.

organizations.[31] Thus we might expect a lower ratio of these agencies per thousand of population in ghettos than in other areas unless, possibly, a higher density of compensatory-helping organizations compensates numerically for fewer churches and developmental-recreational agencies.

With respect to the sheer numbers of human service organizations -- as opposed to their dispersion -- it is worthwhile noting again that there was an increase of 46% in the number of human service agencies between 1970 and 1982, a period during which the population increased 14%.[32]

Membership and Clientele of Human Service Organizations

Aggregate data describing independent sector participants by race, sex, and marital status is not collected. Although some agencies have begun to develop client profiles, the 16-24 age cohort is unlikely to be a sub-category. The information that follows is suggestive rather than definitive.

Membership in developmental-recreational organizations declines as youngsters progress through their teen years. To illustrate, the following table shows the distribution by age of membership in three national, developmental-recreational youth organizations with "traditional" after-school-and-on-weekends programs. "Org. A" is coed (one-third female, two-thirds male) with youth from blue collar families heavily represented. The membership of "Org. B" is all female and of "Org. C" all male, and both organizations are widely considered to draw their members from predominantly middle class families.

---

[31] See Colleen Cordes, "Chicago Sociologist Challenges 'Culture of Poverty' as Explanation for Plight of Inner-City Poor," Chronicle of Higher Education, March 11, 1987, pp. 7 and 13.

[32] Gronbjerg et al., p. 31. Population totals for 1970 and 1982 are taken from Tables 24 and 25 in Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1987.

	"Org. A"	"Org. B"	"Org. C"
11 and under	47%	91%	65%
12-14	33	7	
15-18	18	2	35 including ages 12-14
19-21	2	-	-

Commenting on this pattern, a senior staff member observes of teenagers,

> They're trying different things, versus the younger ones who are more or less focused by their parents;and there are also high school sports, band, sports they're starting to get jobs -- baby sitting, real jobs.

Since parent involvement and support are associated with membership in youth organizations, it may be that as teens grow older, parents are less insistent on participation -- or less persuasive.[33]

Some national youth organizations have developed "new and nontraditional" programs (i.e., programs established since the youthful participation of the author and most readers of this paper) designed to attract older teens. One traditionally single sex organization now has coed groups in its programs for ages 14-18 and has developed a career exploration program in association with high schools. These programs now account for 25% of that organization's total youth membership.

Typically, national youth organizations do not compile racial and ethnic profiles, although this situation may be changing. At two organizations, headquarters staff speculate that racial and ethnic data may be collected locally or regionally by affiliates, and at least one national youth agency will be seeking outside funding to collect data for a profile of its national membership.[34]

The United Way encourages its locals to trace the allocation of UW dollars according to the dominant race or ethnic minority served by each program but does

---

[33] Judith B. Erickson, Directory of American Youth Organizations, Boys Town, Nebraska: 1983, p. 10.

[34] Conversation with author, May 1987.

not publish a breakdown by age group. UW statistics on minorities benefitted during 1986 are intended to demonstrate "that United Ways *do* serve a broad range of clients."[35] Of particular interest in the following table is the allocation to a predominantly black clientele of $1 of every $4 expended for Income Security/Employment/Economic Development. However, blacks rank very low in the allocation of dollars for Physical Health/Mental Health/Developmental Disabilities.

Percentage of United Way Dollars Allocated
by Dominant Race or Minority Served
by Each Program, 1986[36]

	All Races	Caucasian	Black	Hispanic	Other
Income Security, Employment, Economic Dev.	50.8%	21.0%	25.0%	2.7%	0.5%
Physical Health, Mental Health, Dev. Disabilities	62.3	31.7	3.6	1.9	0.5
Food, Clothing, Housing Transportation	67.3	19.0	9.6	3.4	0.8
Formal and Informal Education	50.8	24.9	18.5	4.0	1.7
Environmental Protection	--	--	--	--	--
Public Protection, Consumer Protection, Disaster Prep.	74.7	13.5	7.0	4.8	0.3
Social Adjustment, Arts, Culture, Religion	53.7	30.8	12.4	3.0	0.3
Social Organizations, Voluntarism, Technical Assistance	62.6	19.7	14.7	2.4	0.6

---

[35] Profile 1986, p. 62. Italics theirs.

[36] Profile 1986, p. 68.

Like the United Way statistics, data covering the entire human services subsector does not lend itself to an extrapolation of minority participation among 16-24 year olds. Even so, this data can be helpful, as in the table below which shows the proportion of human service agencies where target groups of interest to the Commission are less than 10% of the human services clientele:

Target Populations as a Percentage of Agency Clientele[37]

	Less than 10% of clientele at
unemployed	3 1/2 out of 10 agencies
blacks	6 out of 10 agencies
Hispanics	8 out of 10 agencies
poor	5 out of 10 agencies

Looking at the data from the other end of the telescope, so to speak, these same target populations are reported to be the *primary* clientele of agencies as follows:

	More than 50% of clientele at
unemployed	2 out of 10 agencies
blacks	1 1/2 out of 10 agencies
Hispanics	1/2 out of 10 agencies
poor	3 out of 10 agencies

Principal Issues Concerning Youth Organizations and Human Service Agencies Catering to Young Adults

Funding -- its sources and uses -- is a fulcrum issue that cuts across all types of agencies. Organizational survival and, if possible, growth in the quality and/or breadth of services are goals of essentially all human service agencies. These goals exist in youth organizations and in adult organizations with a young adult clientele, regardless of the organization's mission.

In developmental-recreational agencies, membership levels are a widely used barometer of financial stability and organizational health. These indices may fluctuate not only in relation to changes in social attitudes but also,

---

[37] Statistics for percentages of clientele can be found in Gronbjerg et al., p. 35.

especially among youth organizations, as a function of sheer demographics. In compensatory-helping organizations, as a group more dependent on government monies than developmental-recreational agencies, government funding levels are considered a key indicator of organizational prosperity.

Today, because youth cohorts have been on the decline and federal funds have been cut, all types of agencies find themselves jockeying for available monies; organizational prosperity -- if not always survival -- is said to be at stake. However, as these organizations have turned to marketing disciplines as a "survival strategy in an era of scarcity and increased competition for resources and consumers," some observers detect greater difficulty in planning for and coordinating social services.[38]

The marketing approach has three elements: (1) commercial ventures through product sales or other entrepreneurial activity, (2) higher fees, and (3) fund-raising. Although marketing's impact has yet to be fully documented, one study has compared sources of funds for 1981 and 1983.[39] During this period incoming government funds declined by 5% but total human service agency income increased by 6%, adjusted for inflation. Of the $57,300 in "new" income for the average agency, $7900 was derived from sales, which were disproportionately concentrated in agencies providing employment and training, culture, arts, and recreation, and legal and advocacy services. Private giving increased by 6%, or $5600 per agency on average, but in dollars did not offset the decrease in government revenues as had been exhorted in the political rhetoric surrounding the cuts. Clearly, the most lucrative avenue for raising new revenues has proved to be neither sales nor donations but fees, which increased by $33,900 for the

---

[38] Madeleine R. Stoner, "Marketing of Social Services Gains Prominence in Practice," Administration in Social Work, Vol. 10(4), Winter 1986, p. 52.

[39] Carol J. De Vita and Lester J. Salamon, "Commercial Activities in Human Service Organizations," 1987 Spring Research Forum: Working Papers, pp. 403-412. See especially Table 2 on p. 411. Quoted with permission.

average agency. For the authors of the study, this pattern raises questions about the sector's "ability to continue to serve those in need":

> ...too little is known about the most significant form of nonprofit commercial activity, namely fee-for-service arrangements. We do not know, for example, how nonprofits set their fee structures, what share of costs they cover through their fees, [and] how sliding [scale] fees operate in practice.... [T]he real growth area for nonprofits, and the one with the *greatest potential for altering the basic character of the sector*, is...fee-for-service income.[40]

Thus the reduction in government subsidies may inadvertently be fostering the development of a two-tier system of service. When agencies begin to promote programs for a self-paying, self-referred clientele, the stage is set for "stratification of the service delivery system along social class lines."[41] Furthermore, the influence of market-driven incentives means that programs are more likely to be designed for economically independent older adults than for economically dependent youth or for young adults whose financial status may be problematic.

The responsiveness of a particular agency to youth and young adults may also reflect the organization's auspices -- which can be, for example, national or local, religious or secular. Initial research on contemporary agencies confirms the historical pattern that "...organizations with national auspices are constrained to find highly legitimate, noncontroversial issues to appeal to many localities across the nation; [while] agencies with local auspices are more often constrained to deal with local subgroups of the population in a professional way, focusing on special priorities of local communities...."[42]

---

[40] De Vita and Salamon, p. 408. Italics added.

[41] Ralph M. Kramer and Bart Gossman, "Contracting for Social Services: Process Management and Resource Dependencies," Social Service Review, March 1987, p. 52.

[42] Michael Sosin, "Social Problems Covered by Private Agencies: An Application of Niche Theory," Social Service Review, March 1985, p. 91. for the historical perspective, see David I. Macleod, Building Character in the American Boy: The Boy Scouts, YMCA and Their Forerunners 1870-1920, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1983.

This finding tends to confirm the conventional wisdom that indigenous local agencies are more flexible and sensitive in responding to young people's needs and interests than are local affiliates of national organizations.

For the foreseeable future, however, the attention given to youth and young adults by the independent sector may well be determined by the demographic fact that the United States has entered an unprecedented era in which relationships between the young and the old are changing substantially. Already the over sixty-five population outnumbers teenagers for the first time in history, and the number of older cohorts will rise in concert with the increase in life expectancy and the aging of the baby boom generation. These projections suggest that the social and economic interests of the dependent elderly and of adults near retirement will compete ever more intensely with the needs of young people and may influence the extent to which independent sector services continue to be directed toward youth.[43]

A related demographic issue that may affect the character of the independent sector stems from the changing ethnic and racial makeup of the population. To the degree that minorities experience higher birth rates than the majority, minorities will constitute a larger proportion of the youth and young adult population than of the older adult population from which the governing board and staff members and volunteers of independent sector organizations are drawn. Given a population that today is seventeen percent minority and by the year 2020 will be at least one-third black, Hispanic, or some other minority, independent sector organizations have been advised to adopt "culturally infused intervention

---

[43] The statement on the relative proportion of teenagers and elderly is found in Ian McNett, Demographic Imperatives: Implications for Educational Policy, published by American Council on Education, Forum of Educational Organization Leaders, and the Institute for Educational Leadership, September, 1983, p. 7. For increases in the over sixty-five cohorts, see Palmer, John L. and Gould, Stephanie G., "The Economic Consequences of an Aging Society," Daedalus, Winter 1986, pp. 298-99.

methods and techniques."[44] Underscoring the pertinence of a culturally attentive approach are these comments by a leading youth advocate on the subject of churches in black communities:

> You can't do very much in the black community unless you work with churches. One can argue that too many churches are not relevant to the needs of the young, and that too many young people are not in churches -- just as they're not in school. Even so, the church is still *the* mass institution in our community....Secondly, in the black community, the black church and religious values must begin with the women of the church because they are its backbone.[45]

Notwithstanding the salience of race and ethnicity, some research suggests that socio-economic and geographic factors may be primary influences on the attitudes and behavior of young people. It has been found, for example, that behavior patterns among the poor differ more as a function of geographic context--urban, rural, northern, southern -- than as a function of race.[46] To choose the latter hypothesis in preference to any other is, of course, a reflection of one's values as well as one's assessment of the research; more important to social policy is the implication common to all these emerging theories that independent sector progamming, if it is to be successful, will have to be responsive to differences among young people -- racial, ethnic, socio-economic, geographic, and so on.

To date, however, we have little basis for assessing the impact of these and other factors on the independent sector's programming for youth and young adults. Research on the outcomes of young people's participation (or that of any age group) has been minimal, perhaps because research designs likely to produce the

---

[44] Jack Rothman, Larry M. Gant, and Stephen Hnat "Mexican-American Family Culture," Social Service Review, March 1985, p. 211. The projection of minority population is taken from Harold Hodgkinson, All One System: Demographics of Education, Kindergarten Through Graduate School, published in 1985 by the Institute for Educational Leadership, Washington, D.C., p. 5.

[45] Interview with Marian Wright Edelman, Harvard Education Letter, May, 1987, p. 5.

[46] Ken Auletta, The Underclass. New York: Random House, 1982, pp. xvi and 200.

more useful results are often expensive to implement. For example, a young person's behavior may differ within the youth program as compared to outside it and so the design should permit observations in both settings; or, it may be that developmental-recreational programs succeed in reaching only those young people who already have the characteristics the organization intends to develop, and to account for that phenomenon, a control group is required.

Additional issues affecting agencies serving the 16-24 year-old cohort are discussed below. Each issue is considered under the category of organization in which it looms largest, so that issues affecting developmental/recreational youth organizations most directly are considered separately from those influencing compensatory/helping organizations.

Developmental-Recreational Youth Organizations

The term "youth organization" may bring to mind national character-building agencies such as Girl Scouts, Camp Fire, Boy Scouts, and Junior Achievement, which foster groups, troops, or teams of young peers and are conducted under adult supervision. Or "youth organization" may recall an organization unique to one's own city or town that offers adult-sponsored group activity. For both types of agencies, there are a number interrelated issues of continuing significance to agency staff, researchers, and other observers. These include adult participation, dropoff in teen members, program quality, suitability of programs for their targets, community support, program assessment, and staff salaries and professional status.

Among the staff of some major national youth organizations, *adults* are considered the "mainstay...[whose] importance cannot be overstated":

> One hears over and over again in the youth work field, 'It all depends on the leader.' The best designed program of any national organization can only be as good as the individuals who actually deliver it.[47]

Of course, programs vary in their dependence upon volunteer adults on the one

---

[47] Erickson, pp. 3-4.

hand and paid staff on the other. An observer of locally based programs that rely on paid staff comments:

> We are concerned about the programs where the parents do not come around at all or only when summoned to be told about their youngsters' (or their own) short-comings. This is especially worrisome in low-income communities. Here, many parents face problems of their own--no job, no money, no food, little knowledge of how to get along in a new community of how to find and deal with helping agencies. Non-participation by parents may mean that they are struggling to survive or they are indifferent to their children's needs. Both situations are problems for the whole family.[48]

The pervasiveness of multiple family problems among the poor is cited as one reason why recruiting volunteer adults is difficult in low income areas, especially for traditionally middle class agencies, but recruiting problems have also arisen in other socio-economic groups. One national organization that relies primarily on adult women volunteers is now asking itself if the quality of middle class volunteers has changed because the more ambitious women have entered the work force. Furthermore, some mother-volunteers, whether working in the home or outside it, now feel they "don't have time to be creative" and are requesting more "canned" materials to guide them.[49]

When national and local developmental-recreational youth agencies are compared, those with national affiliation have the advantage of a ready-made structure, a variety of ready-made programs and support material, and a central resource. They are criticized, however, for lacking the flexibility of local organizations which tailor their programming to -- or are formed in response to -- local circumstances and contemporary social problems such as drug abuse, gangs, and teen pregnancy. It is said that local affiliates sometimes refuse to implement the innovative programs advocated by staff at national headquarters, and if a local affiliate does implement a controversial program, the community

---

[48] Gardner, p. 93.

[49] Conversations with author, May 1987.

may object.[50] At the same time, it is reported anecdotally that a community's United Way has considerable influence on youth programming not only in local agencies, but also in the local affiliates of national organizations.[51]

From the point of view of those who stand outside the apparently successful and secure environment of national youth organizations, their programs may appear to be designed exclusively for the consumption of young people who are middle-class, affluent, and, some would add, white. A case in point is the frustration of a youth worker in a predominantly black Midwestern urban ghetto. He reports pleading to no avail with the local chapter of a national youth organization to provide programs that will spark the interest of the gang-oriented youth he is trying to influence.[52]

As for local, indigenous organizations that provide developmental/recreational programs, there are no known published, systematic, multi-city studies describing their numbers and apparent impact. Perhaps with adequate time and resources, we could unearth on a city-by-city basis a few "idea and resource" books similar to the Los Angeles Youth Book, an anecdotal description of successful local programs that includes an eminently quotable summary of problems typically afflicting local youth organizations:[53]

> HERE TODAY, GONE TOMORROW PROGRAMS
> Initiators of new programs...try to start big before they develop a strong support network among parents, local business people, community leaders, public officials, and other organizations in the neighborhood....Programs that get started with a large grant are in a pickle when the grant runs out if they have neglected to develop a support network.

---

[50] Erickson, p. 11-12.

[51] Conversations with author, October 1986 and June 1987.

[52] Conversation with author, October 1986.

[53] Gardner, pp. 91-93.

CONTINUATION CLASSROOM PROGRAMS

We have seen projects that offer a whole catalog of splendid classes and other activities for youngsters....All that is asked in return is that the kids obey the house rules and stay out of trouble. It sounds a little bit like school, doesn't it? But after school is not school...[and] if all or most of a youth center's program is run like a schoolclass after school, where are the youngsters to learn...other skills so essential for responsible citizenship...[such as to] set priorities and make plans for what they will do, make rules that everybody helps to enforce, earn their own money..., [and] assume real responsibility in their own community.

PARACHUTED PROGRAMS

Quite a number of programs have been dropped into low-income, minority communities in the Los Angeles basin by middle-class, Anglo-operated organizations....The parachutists are committed, sincere, and capable, but sometimes they just don't know the territory. The potential helpers may be well established organizations that bring together a group of 'experts' to design a program and then offer it on an outreach basis to low-income communities. Others are people from the world of business or government who drop in on communities with a sure idea of what they can do to help people they have never met before....[Yet] people already there operating programs are the experts on their own community, and others can learn from them.

Depending upon a youth organization's mission and membership size, the dropout of older teens is a cause for concern or simply a fact of life. From a developmental perspective, however, the departure of teen members from adult-sponsored youth organizations may have positive value:

> When children reach junior high school, it becomes almost a rite of passage into the adolescent world to drop out of the youth programs that they enjoyed in their earlier years. In some schools, there is a great deal of pressure felt by youth who continue in groups dubbed 'baby stuff' by their peers. *Decisions about group membership--staying in an unpopular group or refusing to join one that is popular--may be among the first important acts of independent judgment that a young person makes.* The process of choosing can contribute to overall growth and a sense of maturity.[54]

Furthermore, a poll of teens comparing participation in in-school and out-of-school activities

> ...identified two very different groups of peers who were most involved in out-of-school groups: those who were not successful in school

---

[54] Erickson, p. 10. Italics added.

organizations and those who had outgrown the school activities and were looking for greater challenges.[55]

In-school activities were perceived to offer visible benefits such as prestige, status, and recognition while out-of-school organizations offered less visible advantages, such as meeting new people, learning new skills, and using time effectively. It was also evident that these older teens knew little about the senior programs of youth organizations.

Finally, it should be noted that professional youth work is not a remunerative occupation considering the credentials and skills that are sought, if not always required, in staff members. Pay scales for many organizations are well below those for public school teachers.[56]

Compensatory-helping Organizations

Low pay is also viewed as a serious problem in compensatory-helping organizations. In agencies receiving government funds, the problem is built-in because the "fundamental source" of so-called cost efficiencies is the use of "indigenous volunteers, low-paid paraprofessionals, preprofessional interns, unlicensed professionals who may be compensated (in full or in part) by required supervisory hours, lower-paid part-time staff with flexible schedules, 'consultant' staff ineligible for benefits, and 'sub-contractors' and 'free-lance' professionals who accept lower fees in exchange for guaranteed work."[57] One characteristic of this personnel mix is high turnover which, in combination with low pay, results in poor morale. The comparatively low level of pay may also have something to do with the decline of 49% in applications to accredited

---

[55] Erickson, p. 10.

[56] Erickson, p. 12.

[57] Kramer and Grossman, p. 48.

schools of social work between 1975 and 1982.[58]

As compensatory-helping organizations continue to view "marketing" as the chief strategy for insuring organizational prosperity, services provided to the poor may decline while energies are siphoned off into new programs addressed to a middle class clientele that will bring in new revenues. In the meantime, some agencies have already been accused of 'creaming,' that is, selecting the more 'promising' or the least expensive cases as a means of demonstrating positive, cost-efficient outcomes."[59]

In general, the compensatory-helping agencies are experiencing a degree of professional ferment both at the clinical and managerial levels. On the managerial side, the forms of accountability associated with government funding require "managerial values, attitudes, knowledge, and skills that are different from the traditional competencies associated with the administration of voluntary agencies dependent upon community contributions."[60] On the clinical side, there is a movement away from the traditional casework model which draws upon context toward the medical model which implies diagnoses -- and reimbursement through health insurance. One caseworker is quoted as objecting, "But the clients I see don't have mental illnesses. They just need help. They have external problems."[61]

Compensatory-helping programs are shaped by professional views and client needs and also by the preferences of government agencies and foundations. With respect to government, "there is considerable evidence to support the hypothesis

---

[58] The source of the statistic is Richard L. Edwards and Stuart A Kirk, "Organizational Responsed to Resource Decline: The Case of Schools of Social Work," Administration in Social Work, Summer 1986, p. 18.

[59] Susan A. Ostrander, "Voluntary Social Service Agencies in the United States," Social Services Review, September 1985, pp. 441 and 443.

[60] Ostrander, p. 442.

[61] Ostrander, p. 442.

that...service providers are generally able to maintain a *relatively* high degree of independence while serving as a vendor or public agent."[62] On the other hand, what professionals think people need--or what the clients themselves say they need -- may not coincide with funders' guidelines.[63] At the same time, agency executives seem to feel caught in the bind of having to develop new approaches in order to meet the funders' requirement that programs be "innovative." One-year grants, especially, provide insufficient time to implement and assess a new program, and in general, short timeframes tend to work "against the interests of the local, single program agencies and [favor] the larger, more bureaucratic organizations that have specialized staff with grant preparation and management skills...."[64] Short time frames also make it difficult to establish credibility among referring entities, especially among public sector agencies reluctant to make referrals to a new program of uncertain duration.[65] Achieving credibility among referring agencies is often a major task for new compensatory-helping agencies and for new programs within established organizations.

Theories and Rationales Supporting or Faulting the Role and Function of Independent Sector Organizations

No specific theory attempts to account for the independent sector's role in relation to youth and young adults. We can say only that for the past century and a half, a continuing, *implicit* assumption of those associated with youth work has been that independent sector organizations properly supplement, or in some circumstances stand in place of, a young person's family. But in expositions of pluralist or other theory, the implications for young people are rarely mentioned

---

[62] Kramer and Grossman, p. 42. Italics added.

[63] Ostrander, p. 444.

[64] Kramer and Grossman, p. 44.

[65] Kramer and Grossman, p. 49. This has also been apparent in my own field studies.

specifically, as is illustrated in the following summary of independent sector theory.

The view that a democratic people has the right to express diverse and competing interests through private voluntary organizations is customarily referred to as pluralism. As a perspective on American culture and politics, pluralism has dominated scholarly analysis since Tocqueville and, as an expression of ideology as well as theory, has come to imply that private, voluntary association, especially in comparison to statism, constitutes the only uncorrupted form for social action. One contemporary expression of this theory holds that in a majoritarian political system which "runs the risk of overriding the intense preferences of a minority," independent sector organizations enable the polity to adjust to strongly held minority beliefs:

> [t]he distinctive role of the Third Sector is....to provide the organizational framework that will enable minorities[66] -- including minorities who consider themselves better informed or wiser than the majority -- to provide what they believe to be required as distinct from those things that would be generally accepted as necessary.[67]

Advocates of pluralism tend to contrast voluntary organizations with "[g]overnment bureaucracies [that] are simply not constructed to permit the emergence of countless new ideas, and even less suited to the winnowing out of bad ideas."[68] Although preliminary research suggests that "[t]here is little evidence that voluntary agencies are the chief sources of innovation for government,"[69] advocates believe innovation to be among the independent sector's most important contributions:

---

[66] "Minorities" is not limited here to its racial and ethnic connotations.

[67] James Douglas, Why Charity?: The Case for a Third Sector, Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1983, p. 155. Quotations in the introductory clause are taken from p. 24.

[68] Brian O'Connell, America's Voluntary Spirit: A Book of Readings. New York: The Foundation Center, 1983, p. xiv.

[69] Ralph M. Kramer, Voluntary Agencies in the Welfare State, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981, p. 192.

> Each institution in the independent sector is not innovative, but the sector provides a hospitable environment for innovation. Ideas for doing things in a different, and possibly better, way spring up constantly. It they do not fill a need, they quickly fall by the wayside. What remains are the few ideas and innovations that have long-term value. New ideas and ways of doing things test the validity of accepted practice and build an inventory of possible alternative solutions which can be used if circumstances change.[70]

Welfare pluralists, advocating both pluralism and the welfare state, hold that by separating government bureaucracy from the hands-on provision of service, the independent sector promotes "the values of cost efficiency, diversity, innovation, and responsiveness."[71] Speaking specifically to the dependence of the "independent" sector on government, welfare pluralists observe, first, that independent organizations offer certain services not available through government agencies or, if available, not of as high a quality. Second, private agencies are able to respond to local needs, especially if their governing boards mirror the entire community rather than being composed exclusively of elites. And third, government-subsidized private agencies have a vested interest in advocating expanded government support of welfare services and thus are defenders of the less privileged in society. Human service agencies thereby encourage "public support for social welfare programs in a society where there is suspicion of government, and support for voluntary agencies."[72]

Other theories have achieved attention. One economic hypothesis asserts that the independent sector has arisen as a result of market failure. Another hypothesis, more sociological in perspective, focuses on the megastructures of big government, big labor, and big business, and holds that voluntary organizations stand as "mediating structures" between the "large institutions of public life" and the individual person or particular groups. Without these

---

[70] O'Connell, p. xiv.

[71] Kramer and Grossman, p. 51.

[72] Ostrander, pp. 448 and 449.

mediating structures, a pluralist people would be less able to express differing life styles, ideologies, friendships, races, economic circumstances, religions, and so on, and would therefore have less power.[73]

Because private agencies are said to provide higher quality services than public organizations, they are reputed to draw higher quality professionals into their orbits. On the other hand, private agencies are accused of taking on the easier societal tasks, such as character-building and problem prevention while public agencies deal on both the individual and societal levels with deeply rooted -- and perhaps insoluble -- problems. On this basis, it has been suggested that public agencies provide the essential services and private agencies the nonessential ones.[74]

A negative effect of pluralism, according to some academics, is its "parceling out to private parties the power to make public policy."[75] According to this argument, the ideology of pluralism implies that it is "both necessary and good that the public interest be defined in terms of the *organized interests* of society," namely, independent sector organizations. In practice, this belief and the processes that follow from it penalize those least able to organize themselves, notably the poor and the young.

Another negative commentary on the pluralist hypothesis is offered by public policy analysts who observe that independent sector organizations compete with one another for funds and clients and members and patrons. In these conditions, "a rational system of social service provision in which there is a greater measure of coordination, comprehensiveness, equity, and accountability" becomes

---

[73] Peter L. Berger and Richard John Neuhaus, To Empower People: The Role of Mediating Structures in Public Policy, Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute, pp. 2, 42, and 43.

[74] Ostrander, pp. 438, 445, and 439.

[75] Theodore Lowi, The End of Liberalism: Ideology, Policy and the Crisis of Public Authority, New York: W.W. Norton, 1969, p. 58. The quotation following is found on p. 71, and the italics are mine.

increasingly elusive.[76]

The independent sector is criticized for its failure to conduct assessments of its programs. Except for government-initiated evaluations of federally funded national programs, outcome evaluation -- as distinguished from a report of clients served and dollars expended -- is "exceedingly rare and infrequently requested:"

> Indeterminate technologies, ambiguous goals (e.g., prevention), and very short time limits are conducive to bypassing the complex issues of effectiveness.[77]

Other critics are harsher. Evaluations, they say, are resisted because assessment would reveal not only that human service agencies have very little impact on their clients and members but also that whatever impact they *do* have is often unintended and perhaps negative.

One national youth organization has recently published an evaluation based on "independent research by Louis Harris and Associates, Inc.," but the report is entitled "Testimony to [National Youth Organization]" and contains no problematic or negative findings. Still, such carping may seem mean-spirited in face of the former members' published comments, which reflect the various roles this organization has aspired to play. One former member recalls being saved from delinquency and, by inference, from a life of crime:

> In those days it was really a dog-eat-dog world and you had to learn how to fight, so it was really important to learn now to protect yourself. There used to be a lot of small gangs on every street corner. I think if I wasn't involved with the [youth organization], I could have been a hoodlum, because that's what was starting before we joined the [youth organization.].

Another former member reminisces about leadership development:

> [Youth organization] made me a better person. In every job I've had, I've been a manager or supervisor. The [youth organization] made me a leader.

---

[76] Grossman and Kramer, p. 52.

[77] Kramer and Grossman, p. 41.

And another recalls an adult who performed parental functions:

> He always had time to sit down and talk to you... It was important to have someone to talk to. He was there to listen if you thought you had a crisis, and would help you realize it may or may not have really been a crisis.

Conventional wisdom holds that millions of Americans, through association with a church, counseling service, scouts, or some other agency, know similar stories or have had similar experiences, and their views, it is said, are sufficient to validate the claims of the independent sector.

Even so, the belief that negative consequences are associated with some attempts to "do good" continues to gain currency. One problem, some scholars contend, stems from the failure of the independent sector (and government) to distinguish sufficiently between "intrinsically dependent" individuals, such as the mentally ill, mentally retarded, and crippled who cannot take care of themselves, and the "extrinsically dependent" who are "made dependent by artifacts of our culture:"[78]

> [The extrinsically dependent] have the intrinsic capacity for mature and autonomous functioning, but because of social or economic roles are in positions where they are incapable of supporting themselves at the most fundamental level. *This group would include the poor...and even some groups whose dependence seems so logical and inevitably a part of their lives that we do not recognize it as an artifact, such as the dependent adolescent.*[79]

For example, the notion that adolescence is a vulnerable period during which young people need the support of character-building agencies such Scouts and the Y developed between 1870 and 1920, when the total number of small boys and teens

---

[78] David J. Rothman, "Introduction," in Willard Gaylin, Ira Glasser, Steven Marcus, and David J. Rothman, Doing Good: The Limits of Benevolence, New York: Pantheon, 1981, pp. x and xi. The idea that "doing good" can actually do harm was initially confined to neoconservative social analysis but can now be observed in the popular media. For example, a Newsweek cover story of January 6, 1986 on the subject of the homeless carried the title, "Adandoned: Well-meant reforms have shattered our system for treating the chronic mentally ill -- and left thousands of them to scrape by on the streets."

[79] Willard Gaylin, "In the Beginning: Helpless and Dependent," in Gaylin et al., p. 30. Italics added.

combined totalled no more than preteen boys alone before 1870. Apparently, the rise of modern adolescence and the organizations that "serve" it was due in part to a decline in the percentages of younger children and the consequent increase in the time adults could spend on the nurture and discipline of older young people.[80]

At present, the effectiveness of the independent sector's role in adolescent character-building is being questioned in some quarters, and recently a "warning from the past" was sounded, based on a 1928 study that took into account participation in Boy Scouts, Sunday School, and other character-education experiences. The study "concluded that attempts to teach character accomplish nothing." Furthermore, because the definition of good character is a value judgment, we continue to be plagued today, as in the 1928 study, by the difficulty of answering the pivotal question, "What is the researcher to take as evidence of improved character?"[81]

In spite of these rumblings, optimism continues to pervade much scholarly and popular discussion of the role of the independent sector in relation to youth. One recent article, for instance, requires us to accept as a given the changes in family life that some have decried as its "breakdown." We are asked "to look beyond family and school to get a full view of the primary networks that make up a [young person's] environment" and to observe that "such community offerings as work experience, athletics, Scouting, and any of a host of others....[give young people] access to adults with a wide range of talents and perspectives not

---

[80] Macleod, David I. Building Character in the American Boy: The Boy Scouts, YMCA, and Their Forerunners, 1870-1920, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1983, p. 20.

[81] Harvard Education Letter, published by the Harvard Graduate School of Education in association with the Harvard University Press, January, 1987, pp. 1 and 4.

likely to be found in a single family."[82] The authors cite a study showing that "recently arrived language minority groups (such as the Vietnamese) who entered the U.S. under church sponsorship and with support from local community organizations have fared much better in schools and employment than those groups (such as migrants of Mexican origin) who have had to rely on family networks."[83]

This implied role for the independent sector recalls the unrealized goals of the earliest Sunday Schools and the "friendly visitors" of other nineteenth century charities, and the vision is appealing.[84] But in day-to-day, routine practice, human service agencies and schools -- like other professionalized institutions -- usually put a higher priority on the interests of their own staff members and organization than on an ephemeral "common good" that theoretically undergirds social altruism. A related "turf" issue is, who will direct traffic in such a network of cooperating entities? The expectation would be for the directing institution -- whether the schools, a human service agency, or a consortium -- to become more powerful that the follower organizations. Of course, this theme of competitiveness and organizational chauvinism can easily be overstated, but it remains a factor that should be acknowledged as educators, social workers, and academics evolve new concepts of social development for youth.

---

[82] Shirley Brice Heath and Wallin McLaughlin Milbrey, "A Child Resource Policy: Moving Beyond Dependence On School and Family," Phi Delta Kappan, April 1987, p. 579.

[83] Heath and Milbrey, p. 578, referring to a 1985 study by the Bilingual Education Office, California State Department of Education, Beyond Language: Social and Cultural Factors in Schooling Language Minority Students. It is not clear to me if, or how, control groups were used in this study.

[84] Sunday schools were not to be an antidote to the breakdown of the family in urban slums and were to provide street arabs -- once a week -- with exposure to individuals from a different walk of life and to an orderly, disciplined group setting. See Paul Boyer, Urban Masses and Moral Order in America, 1820-1920, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978, pp. 34-53.

Author's Concluding Observations

This review has demonstrated that we lack information to describe and evaluate the role of the independent sector in relation to youth and young adults. Whether costly data collection and evaluation research will be considered "worth it" is a question of values. We might feel, from the perspective of reluctant funders and experienced practitioners, that evaluation research is occasionally incomprehensible and sometimes a recapitulation of the obvious. Or, as public policy analysts, we might view human service agencies as second only to the public schools as an institutional resource for implementing social policy for young people; on that basis we would urge development of at least a rudimentary understanding of the agencies' impact. Or as advocates for young people and for the independent sector, we might view evaluation research as the key to making nonprofit voluntary agencies more influential in the lives of youth and young adults. And finally, in our hearts we might feel that the human costs of youthful social pathology are inestimable, but as economists we could calculate the loss in dollars; keeping a juvenile offender in reform school, for example, costs approximately $30,000 per year.[85]

Presumably, if evaluation research were coupled with programmatic fine tuning (so-called formative evaluation), it would be possible to perfect programs sufficiently to "package" them. The package could be distributed to agencies indigenous to a community and to local affiliates of national organizations and tailored by on-site staff to fit particular circumstances. A program on sexual abuse has already been distributed by one national youth organization in this fashion.

The evaluation field, it should be noted, is in something of a turmoil over

---

[85] Fred M. Hechinger, "Reform School Report," New York Times, December 2, 1986.

the relative merits of the "scientific, value-free" approach that aspires to the exactitude of the hard sciences and a "practical, more subjective" approach designed to serve the purposes of decision-makers.[86] "Scientific" evaluation is more costly than the "practical" but, in its use of control groups and its focus on specific variables, provides an essential check on the less elaborate methodology. Unfortunately, no universal formula for organizational success in youth and young adult programming is likely to emerge from either approach or even a blend of them, since values shape the standards by which judgments are made, and values differ. As a practical matter, however, many programs for youth and young adults involve roughly comparable variables, and of the limited dollars likely to be available for evaluation, a ratio of one "scientific" to every three "practical" assessments might serve as a guideline.

We may choose, in the meantime, to take it on faith that the independent sector performs a societal function that is positive and could be more so in its impact on youth and young adults. If a new approach to 16-24 year-olds is desired, organizations might consider providing more hands-on experiences to stimulate the individual young person to "create a vision" of his or her future. As one youth agency staff member puts it:

> One could say by the time you're sixteen it's too late, but if they haven't had the exposure yet, [I say] *let them know the possibilities.*[87]

For certain young people, especially those who have spent all their lives in run-down neighborhoods, the possibilities of mainstream society -- except as they are portrayed on television -- are simply unknown, and independent sector programs that would expose them to the activities of people associated with a variety of occupations and occupational levels would seem to hold promise.

---

[86] See, for example, David S. Cordray and Mark W. Lipsey, "Program Evaluation and Program Research: in Evaluation Studies: Review Annual, Volume 11, edited by David S. Corday and mark W. Lipsey, Newbury Park, N.J.: 1987.

[87] Conversation, June 1987.

Yet, even with "new and improved" programs, we will probably have to cope with the perennial reluctance of youth and young adults to participate in activities designed to be "good for them." Under these circumstances, it is hard to ignore today's marketing disciplines and all that their success implies about the availability of techniques for stimulating desired behaviors among persons of all ages, races, ethnicities, locales, and socio-economic status. If the human services are to tap into this expertise, sophisticated marketing and advertising technicians will have to be recruited into pro bono cooperative endeavors with human service professionals and evaluators. Some may reject this notion as inherently distasteful and commercial. Others will observe that today's marketing technologies embody the potential for new and fearsome techniques of social control. However, cooperative endeavors may also be viewed as the voluntary sector's opportunity to play a role in making these techniques the servants of democratic values and pluralism.

Such faith in the beneficent potential of marketing technology is reminiscent of the Jacksonian era and the faith that supporters of tract societies placed in "the power of the written word to reshape social reality."[88] Indeed, what we know about independent sector organizations and their history suggests that as the wheel of reform turns, it often brings to the fore old ideas in new guises.

A feature of the independent sector not highlighted in the research literature, but evident in my conversations, in the field, is organizational isolation. Executives at agencies catering to youth and young adults profess to know very little about one another's programs and, except in instances where referral patterns have been induced for some particular reason (usually related to government funding), independent sector organizations rarely develop networks to smooth a young person's path from one agency to another -- from youth program

---

[88] Paul Boyer, Urban Masses and Moral Order in America, 1820-1920, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978, p. 33.

to young adult program or from counselling service to character-building agency or from church to bowling league. Although local United Ways bring together the executive directors of their recipient organizations, executives say they would benefit from more meetings, and executives not in the United Way orbit are eager to have the same opportunity. Here, it would seem, is a potential coordinating role for locally-based foundations.

Finally, our increasing understanding of human development offers little to refute the theory that behavioral interventions tend to be more successful the earlier they occur in a young person's life. In planning to benefit 16-24 year-olds, therefore, it will be important to define realistically the limits of the independent sector's potential in affecting the quality of their lives.

Bibliography

Auletta, Ken. The Underclass. New York: Random House, 1982.

Berger, Peter L. and Neuhaus, Richard John. To Empower People: The Role of Mediating Structures in Public Policy, Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute, 1977.

Boyer, Paul. Urban Masses and Moral Order in America, 1820-1920. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978.

Cordes, Colleen, "Chicago Sociologist Challenges 'Culture of Poverty' as Explanation for Plight of Inner-City Poor," Chronicle of Higher Education, March 11, 1987.

Cordray, David S. and Lipsey, Mark W. "Program Evaluation and Program Research" in Evaluation Studies: Review Annual, Volume 11, edited by David S. Corday and Mark W. Lipsey. Newbury Park, N.J.: 1987.

De Vita, Carol J. and Salamon, Lester J., "Commercial Activities in Human Service Organizations." 1987 Spring Research Forum: Working Papers. Sponsored by Independent Sector and United Way Institute.

Douglas, James. Why Charity?: The Case for a Third Sector. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1983.

Edwards, Richard L. and Kirk, Stuart A., "Organizational Responses to Resource Decline: The Case of Schools of Social Work." Administration in Social Work, Summer, 1986.

Erickson, Judith B., Directory of American Youth Organizations, Boys Town, Nebraska: 1983.

Gallup Organization, Inc., The American Volunteer, 1985. Washington, D.C.: Independent Sector, 1986

Gardner, Barbara Seaver. Los Angeles Youth Book: Ideas and Resources for Youth Programs. Los Angeles: The Urban Project, College of Letters, Arts and Sciences, University of Southern California, 1985.

Gaylin, Willard, Glasser, Ira, Marcus, Steven, and Rothman, David J. Doing Good: The Limits of Benevolence. New York: Pantheon, 1981.

Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. Annual Report 1986. New York: Girl Scouts of the U.S.A., n.d.

Gorman, Jim, "Are They or Aren't They?" Foundation News, January/February 1987.

Gronbjerg, Kirsten A., Kimmich, Madeleine A., and Salamon, Lester M., The Chicago Nonprofit Sector in a Time of Government Retrenchment,. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press, 1985.

Harvard Education Letter. Published by the Harvard Graduate School of Education in association with the Harvard University Press. January 1987 and May 1987.

Heath, Shirley Brice and Milbrey, Wallin McLaughlin. "A Child Resource Policy: Moving Beyond Dependence On School and Family." Phi Delta Kappan, April 1987.

Hechinger, Fred M. "Reform School Report." New York Times, December 2, 1986.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. All One System: Demographics of Education -- Kindergarten Through Graduate School. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership, 1985.

Hodgkinson, Virginia Ann and Murray S. Weitzman. Dimensions of the Independent Sector: A Statistical Profile (2nd ed.). Washington, D.C.: 1986.

Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, "Tax-Exempt Status for Your Organization," Publication 557 (Rev. July 1985).

Kimmich, Madeleine H., Gutowski, Michael, and Salamon, Lester M. Child-Serving Nonprofits in an Era of Government Retrenchment. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 1985.

Kramer, Ralph M. and Grossman, Bart, "Contracting for Social Services: Process Management and Resource Dependencies." Social Service Review, March 1987.

Kramer, Ralph M. Voluntary Agencies in the Welfare State, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.

Lowi, Theodore. The End of Liberalism: Ideology, Policy and the Crisis of Public Authority. New York: W.W. Norton, 1969.

Macleod, David I. , Building Character in the American Boy: The Boy Scouts, YMCA, and Their Forerunners, 1870-1920. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1983.

Mauss, Armand L. and Wolfe, Julie Camille. This Land of Promises: The Rise and Fall of Social Problems in America. New York: J. B. Lippincott, 1977.

McNett, Ian. Demographic Imperatives: Implications for Educational Policy. Published by American Council on Education, Forum of Educational Organization Leaders, and Institute for Educational Leadership, September, 1983.

"New Taxonomy Planned for Non-Profit Groups," Chronicle of Higher Education, March 11, 1987.

O'Connell, Brian, ed. America's Voluntary Spirit: A Book of Readings. New York: The Foundation Center, 1983.

Ostrander, Susan A. "Voluntary Social Service Agencies in the United States." Social Services Review, September 1985.

Palmer, John L. and Gould, Stephanie G., "The Economic Consequences of an Aging Society." Daedalus, Winter 1986.

Powell, Walter W., The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1987.

Profile 1986, Metros I-VIII: Fund Distribution Results by Agency, by Program. Alexandria, VA: United Way of America Research Division, 1986.

Rothman, Jack, Gant, Larry M., and Hnat, Stephen, "Mexican-American Family Culture." Social Service Review, March 1985. All One System: Demographics of Education, Kindergarten Through Graduate School. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership, 1985.

Salamon, Lester M. and Teitelbaum, Fred, "Religious Congregations as Social Service Agencies: How Extensive Are They?" Foundation News, September/October, 1984.

Salamon, Lester M., "The Nonprofit Sector and the Rise of Third-Party Government: The Scope, Character, and Consequences of Government Support of Nonprofit Organizations," presentation at the Independent Sector Research Forum, 1983.

Simon, John G. "The Tax Treatment of Nonprofit Organizations: A Review of Federal and State Policies" in The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook edited by Walter W. Powell. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1987, pp. 67-98.

Sosin, Michael, "Social Problems Covered by Private Agencies: An Application of Niche Theory." Social Service Review, March 1985.

Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1987. Washington: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1986.

Stoner, Madeleine R., "Marketing of Social Services Gains Prominence in Practice." Administration in Social Work. Winter 1986.

The author has also drawn upon informal conversations with agency executives in October 1986 and in May-June 1987.

MIRIAM M. WOOD is an independent consultant whose principal activity is research into the leadership and management of nonprofit organizations. She is author of Trusteeship in the Private College, published by the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, and her articles have appeared in the Harvard Business Review and Educational Record. Her offices are located in Chambersburg, Pennsylvania.

At present, Dr. Wood's research is focused primarily on adult leadership of youth-serving organizations. Under the aegis of Yale University's Program on Non-Profit Organizations, she is studying the relationship between youth-serving organizations and junior and senior high schools.

A COMMENTARY

on Miriam D. Wood's

WHAT DOES THE INDEPENDENT SECTOR DO FOR 16-24 YEAR-OLDS?

by Leonard W. Stern

While the author assumes personal responsibility for all opinions stated herein, he wishes to express his gratitude to Heather Johnston Nicholson and Jane Quinn of Girls Clubs of America; Karen Bartz of Camp Fire; and Nancy Hirshbein, consultant to The National Assembly, all of whom provided him with extensive comments on Dr. Wood's paper. Their ideas and their language permeate this commentary so thoroughly that it was impossible to cite each of their contributions specifically.

The Grant Commission is to be commended for commissioning an eminent scholar to examine the contributions made by the "independent sector" to young people in America. Too frequently, commissions, academic institutions and foundations which study and develop policies related to youth ignore the wealth of knowledge which has been accumulated by the voluntary nonprofit organizations which provide direct services to millions of young people.

Dr. Wood, too, is to be commended for tackling an overwhelming assignment. Her paper, which focuses on national data and sector-wide generalizations, provides a valuable baseline for further exploration and raises many interesting questions. But one wishes that she had chosen to spend less time trying to determine how many agencies serve how many 16-24 year-olds, at what cost. While the inferences Dr. Wood draws from "ambiguous" and "inconclusive" statistics are plausible and useful, they do not really inform the reader about what the sector <u>does</u> for this age group, which is, after all, the topic of the paper. The time spent analyzing such statistics means, unfortunately, that Dr. Wood is able only to scan briefly a number of important issues which are raised later in the paper.

The problem with such scanning is not that important issues are ignored or treated without insight. The problem is that, by touching briefly and selectively on such issues, by drawing inferences from conversations with unnamed sources, she leaves the reader with frequently unsubstantiated and pejorative impressions.

Case in point: A ghetto youth worker complains about the stubborn refusal of one chapter of a national youth organization to develop programs which will interest the gang kids with whom he works. This youth worker's conversation with the author is used to lend some credence to the point of view that apparently successful and secure national youth organizations seem to design programs exclusively (sic!) for the consumption of white, middle-class and affluent youth.

Case in point: The independent sector resists evaluation because such assessment would reveal not only the lack of impact of human services agencies, but the fact that their impact may be negative, say unnamed critics.

Perhaps the unkindest case in point: Dr. Wood's own flat-out assertion that human service agencies usually place a higher priority on the interests of their own staff members and their organizations than they do on the "common good."

While Dr. Wood makes a valiant attempt to pose both sides of the multiple issues she raises, the brevity with which she is forced to do so could leave many readers with the unfortunate impression that voluntary organizations -- particularly national organizations -- have questionable motives, do little good, deal with easier and less essential services, avoid assessment of their efforts, do not gather relevant information, and are insufficiently responsive to real needs. Even if unintended and made in the spirit of open inquiry, it is inappropriate to characterize the voluntary sector thus.

This is not to diminish the importance of many of the recommendations implicit or explicit in Dr. Wood's paper. Many of her judgments can be heartily supported:

- o Data on the voluntary sector are woefully inadequate and available only in large categories which are not helpful. This serious problem, of course, is not confined to nonprofits; many voluntary organizations have been lobbying for years to improve governmental data bases.
- o An increase in both the number and the rigor of evaluations should be encouraged. At a time, however, of severe cutbacks in federal funding and new tax laws which decrease incentives for charitable giving, the pressure toward investing scarce resources in direct service is undertandable.
- o Reduction in government subsidies inadvertently may be fostering the development of a two-tiered system of service. As noted below, however, current challenges to agencies' abilities to collect fees for services may be more likely to result in a two-tiered system than would increased fees for service.

- o Successful programming will have to be increasingly responsive to racial, ethnic and socio-economic differences among young people. The unique roles of institutions such as the church in the Black community need greater recognition.
- o Adolescents' decisions about joining groups should be valued as "acts of independent judgment." In fact, it may be the most imaginative and demanding youngsters who choose not to join traditional groups, or who choose to drop out of restrictive school environments. It is also quite possible that, as the author's quote from Erickson indicates, adolescents who are involved in out of school activities frequently include those who are not successful in or who have outgrown school activities.
- o The requirement for increased managerial skills is creating ferment in agencies. However, such ferment is not limited, as Dr. Wood suggests, to compensatory-helping agencies.
- o Regardless of the values of the organized voluntary sector, care should be taken about "parcelling out to private parties the power to make public policy", lest less powerful groups in society be further disempowered. Further, the very independence of voluntary organizations suggests that "a rational system of social service provision in which there is a greater measure of coordination, comprehensiveness, equity, and accountability" will not be forthcoming from their efforts, absent other mechanisms.
- o The increase in the aging population is bound to have an impact on the attention paid to youth, as youth's relative number in the population shrinks. But one should not ignore (especially, in a paper related to the Commission's inquiry into youth and work) the potential this demographic fact has for increased, rather than decreased, attention to the needs of youth. It is quite possible that a shrinking youth population will be increasingly valued and supported by a labor market in desperate need of a competent work force. Beyond that, as the experiences of other nations point up, a caring society need not provide for its increasing elderly population at the expense of its young.

These are samples of the paper's numerous insights which are important indeed. But this highly stimulating and provocative paper prompts further comment:

1) We know more than Dr. Wood suggests. Many voluntary sector researchers share Dr. Wood's frustration about incomplete and ambiguous statistics, particularly as they refer to a 16-24 cohort which is not a standard category for the collection of information. Even so, human service organizations do collect an enormous amount of data. They surely can tell you the number of young peeople they serve. Even a sum of the reported figures of major national organizations consulted by Dr. Wood would provide a minimum estimate which would be of some value.

Although there is little standardization in the manner in which organizations keep statistics, most organizations do collect data based on age, sex and even ethnic and racial identity. We know of few national organizations which could not provide a pretty good racial/ethnic profile of the young people they serve.

Our files at The National Assembly are filled with national organization reports on service and advocacy programs they conduct. Such reports provide a rich source of information. It really is possible to find out more about what this sector does for young people!

Even at the level of evaluation - which admittedly is sparse - there appears to be more there than has met Dr. Wood's eye. Dr. Heather Johnston Nicholson, Director of the National Resource Center of the Girl Clubs of America, reminds us of several areas in which there has been considerable evaluation:

- o in the area of "school to work transition", an area where youth agencies have been active, the Youth Knowledge Development Report details much of what is known about helping young people;
- o programs which encourage female and minority students to persist in math and science beyond high school -- including those offered by youth-serving organizations -- have been reviewed by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, which documented model programs and the characteristics that make them excellent;

o and in the area of teen parenting, where much of the service delivery involves independent sector organizations, the research of the Guttmacher Institute has been invaluable.

Dr. Nicholson, herself the principal investigator in a longitudinal evaluation of pregnancy prevention programs for teenagers which is supported in part by the William T. Grant Foundation, agrees with Dr. Wood that there has been little formal evaluation, but she cautions not to "underestimate the consequent state of knowledge about what works in meeting the needs of young people in the 16-24 age group."

One's level of expectation for scientific evaluation should be limited in a field where, as Dr. Wood points out, "the median number of employees is four full-time and two part-time, and at least one in four of the organizations has no employees at all." Nevertheless, member agencies of the National Collaboration for Youth report to us about serious outcome evaluation efforts in their local affiliates as well as at the national level. In the headquarters of national youth-serving organizations, we see program developers conducting evaluation research, combing the research literature, steeping themselves in theory, examining their service programs, differentiating what works from what does not, and fine-tuning their efforts on the basis of knowledge which is rooted in operations, theory and in research.

(2) We are less self-serving than Dr. Wood suggests. The Grant Commission should not accept unsubstantiated generalizations which impugn the motives and integrity of charitable human service agencies. The assertion that they "usually put a higher priority on the interests of their own staff members and organization, than on an ephemeral "common good" that theoretically undergirds social altruism" is out of place in this paper. So is the unattributed accusation that human service agencies resist evaluation out of fear that they will be exposed as having, at best, little impact, or at worst, negative impact. The thousands of unpaid volunteers and underpaid professionals whose primary interest lies in providing the best possible services for young people surely deserve better.

(3) The dynamics of this sector are more complex than described in this paper. Dr. Wood has packed an admirable amount of analysis into very few pages; she highlights the special problems faced by new agencies, the consequences of shortages of funds and demands for accountability, and similar phenomena. Her summary of "independent sector theory" is useful but too brief; in particular the "market failure" theory is deserving of more detailed probing.

While her distinction between between developmental-recreational and compensatory-helping organizations is helpful, care must be taken to limit the use of such terms. They should be considered as ideal categories used for the purpose of assisting analysis, rather than as actual, mutually exclusive definitions of real organizations. Virtually all of the developmental-recreational national youth organizations offer programs and services that the author might classify as compensatory-helping, such as school age child care, vocational training, and programs for substance abusers, delinquent youth and teenage parents. Many of these programs are offered to offset problems identified by schools, police, parents, government and young people themselves. In using the author's framework, one must not assume that such program mixes do not exist. Only in a footnote is there some suggestion that the categories don't really fit certain national youth-serving organizations.

Limited space confines the author to brief quotes and statements which may also oversimplify distinctions among certain categories of organizations and services. Is it appropriate to categorize services provided by private agencies as "non-essential", or societal tasks such as character building and problem prevention as "easier"? Are these tasks really easier?

Again, when distinguishing between the virtues of national and local agencies, one must eschew oversimplification. National organizations do bring standards of safety and professionalism, tested program interventions and technical assistance. Local organizations can respond promptly and flexibly to local problems and needs. But it

should be remembered that service delivery arms of national organizations are, in most instances, local organizations. Many local affiliates undertake one of a kind programming in response to a particular community's needs. In fact, much national programming has its origin in this type of locally developed program. And national program development does not take place in an ivory tower, without field input. Methods may vary, but we are aware of no national organization which develops programs and materials without field input and field testing.

At yet another level, one hears about agency isolation and the need for coordination, but further examination might uncover that "isolation" is less real than it appears. At the national level, organizations such as the National Collaboration for Youth do help to link organizations. Even at the local level, agencies seem to find ways to communicate with each other, and professionals do build networks of their peers. Of course, this is different from the kind of system which really coordinates and integrates services for individual young people. Much more needs to be done in this regard.

Dr. Wood's analysis of the difficulties in coordinating, however, leaves something to be desired. It is true that "turfism" exists. But Dr. Wood may have misjudged the power factors involved in coordination. She suggests that organizations resist coordination because "the expectation would be for the directing institution -- to become more powerful than the follower organizations." Maybe not. The coordinator does not normally become more powerful than the organizations which are being coordinated, and "umbrella" organizations do not become more powerful than their constituents. If anything it may be the reverse. Powerful individual organizations can enhance or interfere with attempts at coordination. The real power lies not with the organization which coordinates, but with the organization which has money and influence for other reasons.

Funding organizations, for example, tend to have high levels of prestige and power. One must question the "potential coordinating role for locally based foundations" which Dr. Wood espouses. Elsewhere she cautions about bending agency programs to the

availability of funds; it may be wise to keep the funding and coordinating functions separate in order not to distort either process.

(4) Fees for service may not be the "most lucrative avenue for raising new agency revenue" as Dr. Wood states. The data in this area are thoroughly confusing. A study of the Chicago nonprofit sector is cited as the source for the statement that human service agencies derive 30% of their income from fees; a United Way study in eight metropolitan areas indicates that the agencies in those areas receive 22% of their income from dues and fees; and a study which compared sources of fund for 1981 and 1983 is cited to show that fees were a source of most new revenue for the average agency.

Yet, data collected by the Independent Sector* provide a somewhat different picture. It is true that the proportion of revenue coming from fees and dues has increased in recent years. In 1977, private payments accounted for 9.6% of funds raised by social service agencies. These payments were 12.6% of total funds raised in 1984, an increase of only 3% in their share of total revenue, most of which took place between 1977 and 1982.

But the charging of fees is not a new phenomenon. Human service organizations have charged fees for years. The relative importance of fees and dues as a source of support varies by organization, by program and by geography. The YMCAs, which have traditionally received substantial support from fees and dues, report that their mix of revenue has not changed over the past 35 years.

Dr. Wood's paper does a service by warning us that if agencies, in response to the severe federal cutbacks, depend too heavily upon fees for service, there will be negative consequences for those who cannot afford to pay. Agencies could emphasize service to those who pay at the expense of those who cannot.

But we fear even greater consequences from current proposals to limit agencies' abilities to charge fees for service. In recent years for-profit providers of human

---

*(Dimensions of the-Independent Sector, table 44.2 at 119-120, 1986.)

services have proposed that nonprofit organizations either be prohibited from charging such fees or be taxed on such fees, particularly when for profit firms can provide similar services. We are concerned that the enactment of such provisions would create a real two-tier system, under which those who can afford to pay would be served by for profit companies, while public and nonprofit agencies would be left to serve only the poor or people with chronic and difficult problems found to be unprofitable by the business community.

While fees for service may not be the most lucrative potential source of new income, they are significant because they do provide some financial support for the agency; when pegged to one's ability to pay, they do offer the recipient of services a dignified opportunity to contribute to his or her own help; and they enable agencies to serve clientele of various income levels in settings which are not segregated by economic class.

(5) The concept of adolescence is treated too briefly in this paper. One would hope that the Grant Commission is using other means to explore the concept of adolescence, the needs of adolescents, and the relationships between these concepts and needs and the approaches of helpers.

The paper talks briefly to such topics. Yes, "adolescence" may be a social construct, but the rise of modern adolescence and the organizations that serve it cannot be attributed so simply to a decline in the percentages of younger children and the consequent increase in the time adults can spend on the nurturing of older young people. The concept of adolescence did not arise simply to fill a vacuum created by a drop in the birthrate. The modern notion of adolescence developed largely during the industrial revolution, which resulted not only in smaller families, but in society's belief that a period of preparation for adulthood was necessary in order for young people to successfully negotiate in an increasingly complex world. This was a period during which schooling became compulsory and several youth organizations were founded. These developments were also influenced by reformist and progressive movements, during which

many voluntary human service and public social welfare agencies were established to deal with the consequences of massive social, political and economic change.

It is not certain which youth-serving agencies implicitly assume, as Dr. Wood asserts, that "youth and young adults, left alone, are likely to become the willing victims of negative social influences." Certainly, youth-serving organizations want to assist young people to avoid the negative consequences of certain environmental forces, but they do more than just keep kids out of trouble. And there is no basis in reality to believe that youth-serving organizations assume that youth will become "willing" victims of social influences such as poverty, unemployment or discrimination!

(6) Discussions of character-building and value transmission are ambiguous in the paper. There is a suggestion that the "character-building" role of agencies in the independent sector is outdated, a holdover from another time. And even in that other time, apparently it wasn't worth much according to the author. Otherwise, why insert a quote from a 1928 study that "concluded that attempts to teach character accomplished nothing"? It is not clear what the author means by "character-building." It is true that such a vague term is difficult to measure. But agency program outcome statements today talk of self-esteem, confidence, basic values, citizenship, life skills, etc.

And the issue of character-building gets mixed up with the issue of values. The issue of value-free education has been much debated in recent years. It is not certain how the author of this paper views or distinguishes between the transmission of values and the building of character. Is this another "non-essential" service? Does the fact that it is difficult to measure, because "the definition of good character is a value judgment," mean that that it should not be a goal? It is not clear whether the author believes it is appropriate for youth-serving agencies to make value judgments and transmit values, and through the transmission of such values, to attempt to "build character."

(7) Potential "new approaches" and new roles for the voluntary sector have barely been tapped in this paper. Here again it appears that insufficient attention has been paid to the reality of voluntary youth-serving organizations. Otherwise how could it be suggested

that if "a new approach to 16-24 year olds is desired, organizations might consider providing more hands-on experiences to stimulate the individual young person to "create a vision" of his or her future," or that agencies should "let them know the possibilities." What does one suppose youth agencies, in fact, are doing? Ask any youth agency worker or executive and you are likely to find that they define their efforts as "hands-on efforts" which help the individual young person "know the possibilities" and "to create a vision of his or her future." We can cite highly sophisticated programs which have been designed to do just that.

The recommendation in the final paragraph of this paper is confusing. What does it mean to state the value of early intervention in a person's life and then to suggest that "in planning to benefit 16-24 year olds, therefore, it would be important to define realistically the limits of the independent sector's potential in affecting the quality of their lives"? Independent sector organizations know full well the value of early intervention and in fact intervene in the early stages of lives of million of children. What does that mean for defining "realistically the limits of the independent sector", as the author suggests? Does it mean that, to the extent we value early intervention, our attempts to help young people when they are 16-24 must be limited? It is not clear.

Finally, the author's perspective on marketing raises serious questions. She seems to suggest that the "perennial reluctance of youth and young adults to participate" in activities can be dealt with by turning to sophisticated marketing techniques, which can stimulate "desired behaviors among persons of all ages, races, ethnicities, locales and socio-economic status." The same author who raises serious questions earlier in the paper about the consequences of turning to marketing disciplines to help solve financial problems in agencies should be careful about suggesting marketing approaches to manipulate the youth market.

So, at the end we have a title question which goes unanswered. but we have a paper which is highly provocative and raises many questions worthy of further discussion. A few avenues for further exploration come to mind:

- o One of the problems with this paper is it tries to answer the title question at too high a level of abstraction to be useful. As a consequence, at the end of the paper we have little idea about what the independent sector does for 16-24 year olds. Why not try to answer that question? What activities, programs, approaches are undertaken by voluntary organizations which serve young people? If we don't get too frustrated by our inability to get an absolute fix on all of the statistics and all of the activities provided for young people, we can probably come up with a pretty good idea of what this sector does for young people. Agency reports and files are full of such descriptions and assessments, as are the files of foundations, government agencies and corporations which provide support for those programs.

  In looking at what voluntary agencies do, one might wish to partialize the question. If Dr. Wood's paper is to be considered as part of the Grant's Commission inquiry into Youth and Work, that focus is not apparent in the paper. In searching for what voluntary organizations do, one might ask what programs they do provide or have provided which relate to youth and work. Even more specific questions could be asked about what they do to find employment opportunities; or what they do to help women and minority students to improve their math and science skills, or to increase their literacy; or what they do about helping pregnant and parenting teens to prepare for the world of work.

- o This is not to say that it is not useful to attempt to conceptualize issues related to youth at a higher level of generalization. A year and a half ago, speaking at a National Assembly conference on "Young and Old in America", Joan Lipsitz, of the Lilly Endowment, called for a "think tank" on youth. She indicated that advocates for other issues or disadvantaged groups in society have had their causes enhanced when their

efforts were backed up by the analysis, the data, and the program and policy options which are the fruits of such institutions' labors.

- o It is wonderful that so many governmental agencies, foundations, and other groups are taking initiatives on behalf of young people in this country. It does appear, however, that representatives of the voluntary youth-serving field are rarely included on the commissions and advisory committees which guide such projects. Future commissions should be encouraged to take advantage of the expertise and hands-on experience which reside in this field. It is pleasing to see that among the illustrious members of the Grant Commission there are people who work directly with youth in school settings and public agencies. But is it too late to include one of the distinguished leaders from the voluntary sector?
- o It is hoped that the Grant Commission has plans for translating its valuable work into products which will increase public awareness of the needs of youth and will influence public opinion and public policy. The National Collaboration for Youth has developed a major public education program, "Making the Grade." The Commission, the Collaboration and other national youth initiatives should consider development of a joint strategy which will ensure that their efforts have maximum impact.
- o It is hoped that the Commission finds a way to focus specifically on the special opportunities, strengths and needs of females and minorities. As a case in point, Marian Wright Edelman's comments about the Black church might serve as the basis for a separate study. While the relevance of Dr. Edelman's remarks to Dr. Wood's paper was not clear, the church as an institution which can be of help to young people is not sufficiently understood or utilized by those who are working in the service of youth.
- o While the Commission seeks to gather data on 16-24 year olds, it is important that they address the very real differences within the audience of concern. The 16 year old is in a very different place from the 24 year old on the three major issues of the Commission's focus-- work, family and citizenship.

- Dr. Wood's paper indicates that young people are volunteering less. It is not clear how significant the decrease is, but it would support the conventional wisdom that this generation of young people is less socially committed and more materialistic than some previous generations. In any event, if it is true, some things can be done within the voluntary sector. Voluntary agencies might develop more service opportunities for early adolescents, which might foster the volunteering impulse as these young people grow older.

  In general the subject of volunteering seems worthy of the Commission's attention. In recent years the potential of some sort of voluntary national service program has received considerable attention; it is hoped that the Commission will take a serious look at these proposals.

- Finally, the concept of youth participation in decisions which affect them and the world around them deserves further attention. One need not see young people only as the object of service, but as a resource. While marketing approaches may be useful in obtaining initial involvement, continued involvement and success is dependent upon youth participation and youth leadership -- especially with older youth and young adults. Many of the organizations in the National Collaboration for Youth and The National Assembly, as well as others, have years of experience in engaging adolescents, young adults and adults in the affairs of their organizations and the broader society. This is more than developmental-recreational character building. It is an approach which attends to the real interests of young people and the contributions they have to make today, while helping to prepare them for productive citizenship in the future.

LEONARD W. STERN

Leonard W. Stern is Executive Director of The National Assembly of National Voluntary Health and Social Welfare Organizations, whose membership includes thirty-two of the nation's leading human service organizations. The sixty-five year old Assembly is an advocate for the voluntary human services sector; it analyzes issues and promotes sound public policies for the human services, and it involves national agency leaders in efforts aimed at increasing effective management and governance.

Thirteen Assembly members with large youth-serving programs comprise the National Collaboration for Youth. Among the current Collaboration initiatives is "Making the Grade", which will issue, in 1988, a national Report Card on the status of youth in America, kicking off a nationwide program of public education and community engagement.

Prior to assuming his current position, Mr. Stern served on the staff of the National Association of Social Workers and the National Urban Coalition. He has been Deputy Assistant Secretary for Youth in the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. His government career included service in the Model Cities Administration of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice.

Earlier, Mr. Stern was Director of Community Services for the City of Philadelphia's delinquency prevention program.

A COMMENTARY

on Miriam Woods'

"WHAT DOES THE INDEPENDENT SECTOR DO FOR 16-24 YEAR OLDS?"

by Virginia Hodgkinson

In "What Does the Independent Sector Do for 16-24 Year Olds?," Miriam W. Wood provides a description of the scope of youth services available from independent sector organizations. Since gathering detailed data on independent organizations remains a continuing problem, she does an admirable job in trying to estimate the number of organizations that deal with this particular cohort. Her thesis is built on "what organizations offer services to youth" -- that is, programs that "do" something for them. I think that a better question is: "how do we offer opportunities for youth to participate in society and learn to become good citizens?" Ms. Wood looks at a few major youth-serving agencies, such as the Girl Scouts and Boy Scouts, but does not mention Big Brothers and Big Sisters, the Girls Clubs, the Boys Clubs, all of the religious youth organizations, the YMCA's and YWCA's, and numerous other groups that have redirected programs to provide outreach to the more vulnerable youth in our society. All of these organizations and the Red Cross have gone through major planning phases over the past ten years to reach youth who are poor, minority, from single-parent families, etc. Wood also states that membership declines among older adolescents, but several of these organizations have programs to rigorously attract volunteers from this age group.

Since adolescence is a transition period to adulthood, it should not be surprising that young people seek more responsibility and involvement. It has become clear among educators at both the secondary and postsecondary level that citizen participation and education have been neglected parts of American secondary and higher education for too long. Such neglect has led to several

national efforts and has even reached Congress in bills to require national service for all young adults. Perhaps Ms. Wood should have restated her thesis to ask: what institutions, public and private nonprofit, are providing opportunities and outreach for the 16 to 24 year old to serve in his or her society? From this perspective, an enormous amount of new energy from a variety of institutions, organizations, and governmental bodies is starting to regenerate a concern for citizen service among youth. In its turn, the active participation of youth in citizen service provides the doer with more individual responsibility for the society in which he or she lives.

One significant report was High School (1983) by Ernest Boyer, which reported on a study of high school students and their high schools conducted by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. One of the major findings of this study was that students felt isolated from their community and the activities of adult life. Therefore, the foundation recommended that high schools institute "a Carnegie unit" that would require every student to complete a service requirement to "help students see a connection between what they learn and how they live."[1]

Three years later, the Carnegie Foundation surveyed over 5000 high schools to find out how many had programs for students to engage in some form of community service. Charles H. Harrison reported the findings in Student Service: The New Carnegie Unit (1987). Of the 1100 public high schools that responded, 70 percent reported that they had programs where students spent time in in-school or out-of-school service programs. Of those schools with programs, 80 percent reported that the program was voluntary and that, in 80 percent of these programs, students were placed in altruistic situations as opposed to career-oriented situations. While the results were not overwhelming, this report clearly showed that many schools were responding to the need to provide students with opportunities to serve their communities. Harrison provided details about a

range of programs from suburban schools as well as urban schools in Atlanta and Los Angeles. It was clear from this report that students who got involved in community service learned to serve and to "care about" others.[2] It also helped students understand the importance of their participation or, as Boyer summarizes, to alter the "me-me attitude" to caring about others.

In another program, Independent Sector has been concerned about educating young people about service and citizen participation since its founding in 1980. In 1986, it held a student community forum for high school students and their principals who participate in exemplary service programs around the country. As part of this effort, it also involved the major educational associations serving secondary education and published Youth Service: A Guidebook for Developing and Operating Effective Programs (1987) by Dan Conrad and Diane Hedin. This report has been disseminated to high schools all over the country. It cites several major organizations that involve youth and studies about youth service that Miriam Wood has not referenced. Of particular importance are the youth service corps for young people over 18 years of age currently operating in New York, San Francisco, and in ten states. Several other cities and states have such programs under consideration.

Other major reports that have recommended that schools provide more opportunities for youth service are: A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century by the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986); School-Sanctioned Community Service: The State Perspective by Claire E. Cunningham for the State Education Research Center of the Council of Chief State School Officers/National Association of State Boards of Education (1986); Reconnecting Youth: The Next Stage of Reform by the Education Commission of the States (1985); and A Place Called School by John Goodlad (1983). Most recently, the Kettering Foundation sponsored a series of community forums about children at risk. The results of those meetings in eight communities were described in a

report What Do We Want For Our Youth? (1987).

At the postsecondary level, a continuing decline in altruistic interests as reported in The American Freshman: National Norms, Fall 1974-1984, led to the establishment in 1985 of Campus Compact: The Project for Public and Community Service at Brown University, under the administrative oversight of the Education Commission of the States. This Compact resulted from a meeting of several college and university presidents who met to discuss what efforts could be made to increase and encourage greater youth involvement in public service. Over a hundred colleges and universities are members of the Campus Compact program which agrees to:

> dictate a charge to the nation's institutions of higher education to recommit themselves to equipping their students to become the committed, compassionate citizens upon which this nation depends. These institutions must provide the leadership, resources, and focus that will enable youth to envision a better world, an interdependent one but one in which they as individuals can make a positive contribution.[3]

The recognition of this problem by college and university came none too soon. In the Spring of 1985, Independent Sector commissioned the Gallup Organization to conduct a national survey on volunteering in America. The results of that survey showed an 11 percent decline from 1980 to 1985 in volunteering among students between the ages of 18 and 24 years.[4]

Colleges and universities who join the Campus Compact agree to:

> 1) direct a public awareness campaign aimed at re-establishing commitment among students to service for others; 2) develop policies that university and college presidents, state boards of education, policy makers, and others can use to encourage public and community service; 3) conduct a survey of public service activities at the colleges and universities involved in the coalition; and, 4) establish a public service network that will match students seeking service opportunities with local and regional service agencies."[5]

Although an evaluation of this program has not yet been done, anecdotal information suggests that there has been an enormous increase in college student volunteering during the year, and in the creation and support of summer public

service internships at the state and national level. In a recent article, "Students Flocking to Volunteer Service," The Washington Post reports on some of the success of both the high school and college efforts. In Atlanta, all seniors in high school must perform 75 hours of community service in order to graduate. ACTION, the federal agency, gave a grant to organize all Minnesota colleges "into a mass movement of volunteers." California may pass a bill to create a "human corps" which would make community service a requirement for graduation at its public colleges and universities. A survey at the University of California, San Diego reported that 23,000 hours of community service were given by undergraduates in the last year. And a new organization, Campus Outreach Opportunity League (COOL) is providing advice to student volunteer programs at over 300 colleges.[6]

Youth Service America, a national organization founded to advance the development of full-time service corps in states and localities, and the establishment of community service programs in high schools and colleges has reported enormous recent progress in its efforts. It works in collaboration with the Campus Outreach Opportunity League, the National Council of Returned Peace Corps Volunteers, the National Association of Service and Conservation Corps, the Human Environment Center, and Public/Private Ventures. Youth Service America programs operate in urban as well as suburban and rural settings, and report good participation by minority and ethnic groups.[7] Essentially these new efforts by educational leaders who are working in collaboration with major nonpofit organizations as well as thousands of local nonpofit community organizations and institutions are starting to reinvigorate the concept of service as a necessary part of citizenship and of human development. These movements need to be evaluated for their potential to help vulnerable adolescents. Funding and resources need to be provided to schools in inner cities, including stipends for summer internships for students. This movement connects both public and private

organizations, communities, parents, teachers and youth. The results reported anecdotally by schools suggest that at risk students who participate in these programs gain a feeling of belonging, learn to care about others, learn to be on time, dress properly, and act responsibly.

My recommendation to the Commission would be to study such programs to determine their impact upon at risk youth. If such programs are making a difference, adequate resources ought to be provided for professional staff, as well as to expand opportunities for low-income students to participate in internships and other community service experiences.

Virginia Hodgkinson is Vice President for Research, Independent Sector

Sources

Bellah, Robert, et al. Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1985.

Bok, Derek. Beyond the Ivory Tower: Social Responsibilities of the Modern University. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1982.

Conrad, Dan and Hedin, Diane. Youth Service: A Guide for Developing and Operating Effective Programs. Washington, DC: Independent Sector, 1987.

Danzig, Richard and Szanton, Peter. National Service: What Would It Mean? Lexington, MA: DC Heath and Co., 1986

Dass, Ram and Gormon, Paul. How Can I Help? -- Stories and Reflections on Service. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1985.

Domestic Policy Association. What Do We Want for Our Youth?. Dayton, Ohio, 1987.

Evans, Sara and Boyto, Harry. Free Spaces: The Sources of Democratic Change in America. New York: Harper and Row, 1986.

Flanagan, Joan. The Successful Volunteer Organization. Chicago, IL: Contemporary Books, Inc., 1981.

Harrison, Charles H. Student Service: The New Carnegie Unit. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1987.

Horner, Matina. "Self Interest and the Public Interest." in The Quality of American Life in the Eighties. Washington, DC: The President's Commission for a National Agenda for the Eighties, 1980.

Janowitz, Morris. The Reconstruction of Patriotism: Education for Civic Consciousness. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Kendall, Jane, et al. Strengthening Experiential Education in Your Institution. Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education, 1986.

Littwin, Susan. The Postponed Generation: Why American Youth Are Growing Up Later. New York, NY: William Morrow & Co., 1986.

Meisel, Wayne and Hackett, Bobby. Resource Book for Students in Community Service. Washington, DC: The Campus Outreach Opportunity League, 1986.

Newman, Frank. Higher Education and the American Resurgence. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1985.

O'Connell, Brian. America's Voluntary Spirit: A Book of Readings. New York, NY: The Foundation Center, 1983.

Palmer, Parker. The Company of Strangers. New York, NY: Crossroads Publishing Co., 1985.

Thomas, Franklin. "National Service: An Aspect of Youth Development" (reprint of speech). New York, NY: Ford Foundation, 1984.

NOTES

1. Charles H. Harrison. Student Service: The New Carnegie Unit. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1987, p. viii.

2. Ibid., pp. 58-65.

3. "Part I: Background Information on Campus Compact: The Project for Public and Community Service." Unpublished paper available from Campus Compact, Box G, Brown University, Providence, RI, no date.

4. The Gallup Organization and Independent Sector. Americans Volunteer 1985. Washington, DC: Independent Sector, 1986.

5. "Background Information." op. cit.

6. Jay Mathews. "Students Flocking to Volunteer Service." The Washington Post, September 10, 1987.

7. Youth Service America. "Spotlight on Service." Washington, DC: Youth Service America, 1987.

PUBLICATIONS OF
YOUTH AND AMERICA'S FUTURE
THE WILLIAM T. GRANT FOUNDATION COMMISSION ON WORK, FAMILY AND CITIZENSHIP

Publications of the Commission are *not copyrighted* and their distribution is *encouraged.* When quoting or reproducing Commission publications, please note the source as: **"Youth and America's Future: The William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship."**

American Youth: A Statistical Snapshot (July 1987) *by James Wetzel*

Drawing on the latest, statistically reliable government surveys, this demographic review captures much of the diversity inherent in a collective portrait of American 15-24 year-olds. Includes data on marriage, childbearing, living arrangements, income, education, employment, health, and juvenile justice. Historical trends as well as future projections are presented along with *12 charts, 18 tables.*

Current Federal Policies and Programs for Youth (June 1987) *by J.R. Reingold and Associates*

Who is doing what for youth in the federal government? This concise survey of current federal policies and programs for youth in Education, Health and Human Services, Labor, Justice and Defense provides a one-of-a-kind resource for researchers, practitioners, analysts and policymakers who want quick access to accurate information about federal youth policy. *Includes state-level allocation tables.*

Youth Policies and Programs in Selected Countries (August 1987) *by Rosemary George*

Presents the salient features of the post-compulsory education and training policies of 11 foreign countries designed to smooth the transition of non-college-bound youth into the work place, The countries are: Australia, Britain, Canada, Finland, France, West Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Japan, Norway and Sweden. *Includes tables.*

Single copies of these three publications will be available for a *limited time* and without charge from: **William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Youth and America's Future,** Suite 301, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036-5541

Multiple copies may be purchased at **$5.00 each** from either organization:

Institute for Educational Leadership
Suite 310, 1001 Connecticut Ave., NW
Washington, D.C. 20036-5541

or

National School Volunteer Program
Suite 320, 701 North Fairfax Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

* * *

The following **Working Papers** were prepared for the Commission's deliberations by a variety of scholars and practitioners. They are available at **$10.00 each postpaid** from the **Institute for Educational Leadership** (address above).

Youth Transition from Adolescence to the World of Work *by Garth Mangum.* **Commentaries** *by Marvin Lazerson and Stephen Hamilton.*

Youth and the Workplace: Second-chance Programs and the Hard-to-Serve *by Thomas J. Smith, Gary C. Walker, Rachel A. Baker (Public/Private Ventures).* **Commentaries** *by Gary Burtless, Jacqueline Danzberger, Morton Sklar, Richard F. Elmore.*

Who Will Train and Educate Tomorrow's Workers? The Financing of Non-College-Bound Young Workers *by Robert Sheets, Andrew Hahn, Robert Lerman and Eric Butler.* **Commentaries** *by Peter L. Szanton, Paul V. Delker and Warren Ziegler.*

Youth and Work: What We Know; What We Don't Know; What We Need to Know *by Ivan Charner and Bryna Shore Fraser (National Institute for Work and Learning).* **Commentaries** *by Sue E. Berryman and Hayes Mizell.*

The Bridge: Cooperative Education *by Cynthia Parsons.* **Commentaries** *by Dennis Gray and David Lynn, Morgan V. Lewis, Roy L. Wooldridge.*